

THE STANDARD

NO. 74-VOL. III, NO. 2

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

"The Standard" is sent this week to a number of persons whose friends have paid to have the paper forwarded to them for four weeks in the hope that they may be induced to read it, examine the principles it advocates, and become regular subscribers. Those who receive the paper without having ordered it will understand that it has been sent in this manner and will be sent for four successive weeks without charge to them.

Terms of subscription will be found on the fourth page.

CONTENTS:

Cartoon.
Anti-Poverty in England.
United Labor Party in New York.
Brews Which Show the Wind.
Words of Thomas Carlyle.
The New Jersey Censor.
Pen, Paste and Scissors.
Slavery at Home and Abroad.
The Anderson Bill.
Calfet Taxation.
Mr. Cox on the Tariff.
Society Notes.
Men and Things.
Foreign Notes.
Coal Mining, Protection and Royalties.
The Indians.
Plain Truth About Protection.
An Immigrant's Story.
Fluncheon Opposed to Party Action.
The Seating of the Drama.
Queries and Answers.
The Labor Question.
Current Thought.

The written opinion of Vice-Chancellor Bird of New Jersey in support of his decision declaring void the bequest of the late George Hutchins of that state for the circulation of my books, has now been filed, and on another page a certified copy of it is printed in full.

The reason assigned for this astonishing decision is, if possible, more astonishing still. After the most ridiculous travesty of my aims and teachings, Vice-Chancellor Bird goes on to show why, even if my books were what he assumes them to be, both reason and authority would forbid him from presuming to declare that they should not be circulated. He suggests, when he does not state, the preposterous and tyrannical consequences which would be involved in such an interference with the liberty of speech and of discussion; he admits that there is nothing in the books of an irreligious, rebellious or treasonable character, or that is "directly calculated to foment public disturbances or to incite the masses of the people to revolt;" he admits that to lay down the principle that the courts would not permit bequests for the circulation of books advocating changes in the laws (which is all that my books advocate) would condemn all donations for the spread of the gospel and for foreign missions. He does all this, and then, forsooth, he proceeds to annul Mr. Hutchins's bequest because of one solitary declaration in my books—viz., that private property in land is robbery. This he specifically declares is the one thing—the only thing—on which he bases his decision.

If Vice-Chancellor Bird, being called upon to pass on a bequest for the distribution of bibles, were to quote from the scriptures in this fashion:

Judas went and hanged himself. . . . Go, thou, and do likewise.

If he were then to go on and draw a horror-stricken picture of the ruin that would overtake society and the desolation that would come upon the earth if everybody were to go and hang themselves; and if, admitting that he could find in this proposal that men should extirpate themselves, nothing which gave him legal warrant for breaking the bequest, he were to still go on and break the bequest because he found in the book such expressions as "Swear not at all," or "Woe unto ye, lawyers! for ye have men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers"—taking the ground that those utterances denounced a custom observed in the courts and were calculated to bring the bench into disrepute, he would be doing just what he does in this opinion.

If in the fact that in commenting on Herbert Spencer's declaration, "Had we to deal with the parties who originally robbed the human race of its heritage we might make short work of the matter"—I say "It is not merely a robbery in the past, it is a robbery in the present;" if in the fact that preliminary to a historical review of the origin of the idea which attaches to land the same exclusive right of ownership that justly attaches to the things produced by human labor, I say "Historically, as ethically, private property in land is robbery," Vice-Chancellor Bird finds the only reason for breaking Mr. Hutchins's will, why does he prostitute a judicial opinion by making it the vehicle for a false and malicious travesty of my views and aims? All that, on his own showing, is, as the lawyers say, *attitude*—has nothing to do with the reason he gives for his decision. It is simply the lying appeal of the demagogue to the ignorance of the mob. If Mr. Bird were an irresponsible stump speaker, a vicar general writing for a magazine, or an editor of the *Evening*

pic. Dr. Wright smile contemptuously at his Mendelsohn 167 earth to a common, destroying the on of all property, and turning "the sweet, reviving, life-giving sunshine of our present civilization" into the darkness of nomadic barbarism. But it should arouse a graver feeling when the man who makes this travesty is a vice-chancellor of New Jersey—a judge sitting on the bench, going through the form of administering justice, and bound by the most solemn obligations to speak truthfully and deal fairly.

Vice-Chancellor Bird had the books he misrepresents officially before him. He says he has gone through them, and from two of them he makes extracts. Now it is utterly impossible that he should even have glanced over them without seeing that what they propose is no disturbance of the exclusive title to the possession and use of land; no reduction of tenures to the momentary occupation of the soil under one's feet; no lessening of the security that he who plows may reap; no throwing open for any one to enter, the houses or the barns that labor has raised; no depriving the widow and the orphan of the fruits of the toil of husband or father; no taking from Astor or Vanderbilt of any portion of any structure they may have erected, or of any article produced by man of which they have become possessed; no question of what shall be done with "the billions of dollars of improvements which now beautify and adorn the earth." When Vice-Chancellor Bird, with my books before him, in an official opinion, delivered under the sanction of his judicial oath, declares that this is what he finds in them, he is guilty of the solemn assertion of a deliberate, gratuitous and malicious falsehood. Not only is it impossible that he could even glance through these books without seeing that they fully recognize the rightfulness and necessity of the exclusive, individual possession of land, and that they assert most emphatically, and propose to secure far more fully than is at present secured, the absolute right of the improver to his improvements, the absolute right of the producer to all that he produces; but it is impossible that the vice-chancellor should have read the connecting passages between the sentences he quotes without clearly seeing this.

He not only quotes from my books the declaration that "the land of every country belongs to the people of that country," without telling his hearers that it was John Stuart Mill that said this. He not only quotes from my comments on Herbert Spencer without telling his hearers that Herbert Spencer, as well as I, declares private property in land to be founded on robbery. He not only quotes from my exposition of Thomas Jefferson's doctrine that no generation can rightfully bind another to the payment of a public debt, without saying one word of Thomas Jefferson. But he carefully cuts out and eliminates by asterisks passages that lie between the sentences and parts of sentences he quotes, which, if left in their proper places, would show the utter falsehood of the travesty of my doctrines that he makes.

I do not call names. I merely state facts. No one can read—I will not say my books, which Vice-Chancellor Bird says he has gone through; but simply the context of the sentences he has quoted from these books—without seeing that in this opinion the vice-chancellor has resorted to deliberate suppression in order to give currency to a falsehood, and that he is in this the worst kind of a false witness—a false witness sitting on the bench of justice and bound by the judicial oath.

But all this is beside the decision. The elaborate misrepresentation, in which Vice-Chancellor Bird indulges, he throws in merely for the prejudicing of the groundings. Although the ridiculous and destructive doctrine which he pictures me as advocating "involves our homes and our firesides, our church and our state, and all the institutions established and regulated thereby," although it would "sweep away every thought or sentiment or link which binds individuals to locality, to home, to society, or to government, and send him adrift without rudder, or sail, or guiding star, or beacon light, or a tent to shelter, or a cabin for himself or his little ones," the vice-chancellor cannot find any law for forbidding a bequest for its dissemination, and has too much regard for "freedom of speech and liberty of the press" to try. He formally declares that any citizen of New Jersey may safely leave whatever he pleases for the dissemination of doctrines that would set not only all Jerseymen, but everybody else adrift in this helpless fashion, and the New Jersey courts will permit it. It is for no such little



things that this most cautious vice-chancellor declares the Hutchins bequest invalid. It is for something infinitely worse, as he seems to think, than the destruction of church and state and home and fireside, and the setting of people adrift in this ruthless fashion—it is for saying that private property in land is robbery!

This, then, is freedom of speech and liberty of the press in New Jersey, according to this New Jersey vice-chancellor! You may freely write, speak, print or utter your sentiments with regard to anything that is sanctioned by the laws, provided, you say nothing disrespectful of it! The free trader may oppose a tariff which levies taxes on one man to give a bounty to another man, but must not say protection is theft. The Sabbatarian may oppose the moving of trains on Sunday, but he must not say it is a sin. The anti-monopolist may respectfully object to the conferring of public franchises upon private corporations, but must not say that this involves robbery. The prohibitionist may urge the legal suppression of the liquor traffic, but so long at least as it is recognized by the law, must not say that it is a murderous one, or a poverty-breeding one, or any of the many things of the kind that temperance people are constantly saying about the liquor business. To say, in short, that anything which the laws of New Jersey permit and the courts uphold is contrary to the moral law is, according to the principle of Vice-Chancellor Bird's opinion, forbidden in New Jersey—not because it may not be true, but because it is to intimate that what the courts may be obliged to uphold is in itself wrong! How many reasons for declaring void a bequest for circulating the bible might not the vice-chancellor find, on this principle, if he searched for them as industriously and with as much determination as he has searched for a reason for declaring void the Hutchins bequest!

But the reason which Vice-Chancellor Bird assigns for declaring void the Hutchins bequest is one he has not found—he has deliberately manufactured it. In order to do this he makes two quotations from "Progress and Poverty"—the one, a paragraph beginning "It is not merely a robbery in the past, it is a robbery in the present," and the other the sentence "Historically as well as ethically private property in land is robbery." Then he goes on:

Clearly the author in these passages not only condemns existing laws, but denounces the fact of the secure title to land in private individuals as robbery—as a crime. It is this aspect of the case which leads me to the conclusion that the court ought to refuse its aid in enforcing the provisions of this will. Whatever might be the rights of the individual author in the discussion of such questions in the abstract, it certainly would not become the court to aid in the distribution of literature which denounces as robbery—as a crime—an immense proportion of the judicial determinations of the higher courts.

Clearly, and as an absolute matter of fact, I have done nothing of the kind. Here are the two passages from which the vice-chancellor makes his two quotations, the words he has quoted being inclosed in brackets. They are both from Book VII of "Progress and Poverty," entitled "Justice of the Remedy." The first is from Chapter III, entitled, "Claim of

Land Owners to Compensation." It is as follows:

Herbert Spencer says: "Had we to deal with the parties who originally robbed the human race of its heritage, we might make short work of the matter." Why not make short work of the matter anyhow? For this robbery is not like the robbery of a horse or a sum of money, that ceases with the act. It is a fresh and continuous robbery, that goes on every day and every hour. It is not from the produce of the past that rent is drawn; it is from the produce of the present. It is a toll levied upon labor constantly and continuously. Every blow of the hammer, every stroke of the pick, every thrust of the shuttle, every throb of the steam engine, pay tribute. It levies upon the earnings of the men who, deep under ground, risk their lives, and of those who over white surges hang to reeling masts; it claims the just reward of the capitalist and the fruits of the inventor's patient effort; it takes little children from play and from school, and compels them to work before their bones are hard or their muscles are firm; it robs the shivering of warmth; the hungry, of food; the sick, of medicine; the anxious, of peace. It debases, and embroiles, and embitters. It crowds families of eight and ten into a single squalid room; it herds like swine agricultural gangs of boys and girls; it fills the gin palace and groggery with those who have no comfort in their homes; it makes lads who might be useful men candidates for prisons and penitentiaries; it fills brothels with girls who might have known the pure joy of motherhood; it sends greed and all evil passions prowling through society as a hard winter drives the wolves to the abodes of men; it darkens faith in the human soul, and across the reflection of a just and merciful creator draws the veil of a hard, and blind, and cruel fate!

[It is not merely a robbery in the past; it is a robbery in the present—a robbery that deprives of their birthright the infants that are now coming into the world. Why should we hesitate about making short work of such a system? Because I was robbed yesterday, and the day before, and the day before that, is it any reason that I should suffer myself to be robbed to-day and to-morrow? any reason that I should conclude that the robber has acquired a vested right to rob me?]

If the land belong to the people, why continue to permit land owners to take the rent, or compensate them in any manner for the loss of rent? Consider what rent is. It does not arise spontaneously from land; it is due to nothing that the land owners have done. It represents a value created by the whole community. Let the landholders have, if you please, all that the possession of the land would give them in the absence of the rest of the community. But rent, the creation of the whole community, necessarily belongs to the whole community.

Try the case of the land holders by the maxims of the common law by which the rights of man and man are determined. The common law we are told is the perfection of reason, and certainly the land owners cannot complain of its decision, for it has been built up by and for land owners. Now what does the law allow to the innocent possessor when the land for which he paid his money is adjudged to rightfully belong to another? Nothing at all. That he purchased in good faith gives him no right or claim whatever. The law does not concern itself with the "intricate question of compensation" to the innocent purchaser. The law does not say, as John Stuart Mill says: "The land belongs to A, therefore B who has thought himself the owner has no right to anything but the rent, or compensation for its saleable value." For that would be indeed like a famous fugitive slave case, in which the court was said to have given the law to the north and the nigger to the south. The law simply says: "The land belongs to A, let the sheriff put him in possession!" It gives the innocent purchaser of a wrongful title no claim, it allows him no compensation. And not only this, it takes from him all the improvements that he has in good faith made upon the land. You may have paid a high price for land, making every exertion to see that the title is good; you may have held it in undisturbed possession for years without thought or hint of an adverse claimant; made it fruitful by your toil or erected upon it a costly building of greater value than the land itself, or a modest home in which you hope, surrounded by the fig trees you have planted and the vines you have dressed, to pass your

declining days; yet Quirk, Gammon & Snapp can mouse out a technical flaw in your parchments or hunt up some forgotten heir who never dreamed of his rights, not merely the land, but all your improvements, may be taken away from you. And not merely that. According to the common law, when you have surrendered the land and given up your improvements, you may be called upon to account for the profits you derived from the land during the time you had it.

Now if we apply to this case of The People vs. The Land Owners the same maxims of justice that have been formulated by land owners into law, and are applied every day in English and American courts to disputes between man and man, we shall not only not think of giving the land holders any compensation for the land, but shall take all the improvements and whatever else they may have as well.

But I do not propose, and I do not suppose that any one else will propose, to go so far. It is sufficient if the people resume the ownership of the land. Let the land owners retain their improvements and personal property in secure possession.

And in this measure of justice would be no oppression, no injury to any class. The great cause of the present unequal distribution of wealth, with the suffering, degradation and waste that it entails, would be swept away. Even land holders would share in the general gain. The gain of even the large land holders would be a real one. The gain of the small land holders would be enormous. For in welcoming Justice men welcome the handmaid of Love. Peace and Plenty follow in her train, bringing their good gifts, not to some, but to all.

How true this is we shall hereafter see. If in this chapter I have spoken of justice and expediency as if justice were one thing and expediency another, it has been merely to meet the objections of those who so talk. In justice is the highest and truest expediency.

The second is from Chapter IV, entitled, "Property in Land Historically Considered."

The observations of travelers, the researches of the critical historians who within a recent period have done so much to reconstruct the forgotten records of the people, the investigations of such men as Sir Henry Maine, Emile de Lavelye, Professor Nassau, and others, into the growth of institutions, prove that wherever human society has formed the common right of men to the use of the earth has been recognized, and that nowhere has unrestricted individual ownership been freely adopted. [Historically, as ethically, private property in land is robbery.] It nowhere springs from contract; it can nowhere be traced to perceptions of justice or expediency; it has everywhere had its birth in war and conquest, and in the selfish use which the cunning have made of superstition and law.

Wherever we can trace the early history of society, whether in Asia, in Europe, in Africa, in America, or in Polynesia, land has been considered, as the necessary relations which human life has to it would lead to its consideration—as common property, in which the rights of all who had admitted rights were equal. That is to say, that all members of the community—all citizens, as we should say—had equal rights to the use and enjoyment of the land of the community. This recognition of the common right to land did not prevent the full recognition of the particular and exclusive right in things which are the result of labor, nor was it abandoned when the development of agriculture had imposed the necessity of recognizing exclusive possession of the land in order to secure the exclusive enjoyment of the results of the labor expended in cultivating it. The division of land between the industrial units, whether families, joint families, or individuals, only went as far as was necessary for that purpose, pasture and forest lands being retained as common, and equality as to agricultural land being secured, either by a periodical re-division, as among the Teutonic races, or by the prohibition of alienation, as in the law of Moses.

This primary adjustment still exists, in more or less intact form, in the village communities of India, Russia, and the Slavonic countries yet, or until recently, subjected to Turkish rule; in the mountain cantons of Switzerland; among the Kabyles in the north of Africa, and the Kafirs in the south; among the native population of Java and the aborigines of New Zealand—that is to say, wherever extraneous influences have left intact the form of primitive social organization. That it everywhere existed has been within late years abundantly proved by the researches of many independent students and observers, and which are (to my knowledge) best summarized in the "Systems of Land Tenure in Various Countries," published under authority of the Cobden club, and in M. Emile de Lavelye's "Primitive Property," to which I would refer the reader who desires to see this truth displayed in detail.

Are the deductions which the vice-chancellor draws from these passages warranted? Do I, as a matter of fact, denounce "the secure title to land in private individuals as a robbery—as a crime?" Do I, as a matter of fact, "denounce as a robbery—as a crime—an immense proportion of the judicial determinations of the higher courts?" Even in those passages which the vice-chancellor has selected as best suiting his purpose, it may be seen, as is clearly stated in all my books, that I regard the secure title to land in private individuals as necessary to the best use of land, and instead of weakening it would strengthen it. Even in those passages it may be seen, what in other parts of "Progress and Poverty," as in my other books, is stated with the utmost clearness, that in speaking of private property in land as a robbery I do not mean the private possession of land, as Vice-Chancellor Bird would make it appear, but what M. de Lavelye calls *quiritary property*—the attaching to land of the same full rights of exclusive ownership that justly attach to things produced by labor. Even in those passages may be seen, what in other parts of the same book, and all my books, is clearly stated, that I do not regard private property in land as an individual robbery or crime, but as a

social robbery or crime, for which, not land owners as a class, but the whole people, are responsible. Neither in the passages, from which he selects, nor in any part of my writings can Vice-Chancellor Bird find the slightest justification for his deductions.

I have never recommended that the laws which relate to property in land should not be obeyed; I have never denounced the courts for enforcing them; I have merely urged that the law should be changed, in the appointed and constitutional way—and in this what I have urged is, not a change in the laws relating to the tenure of land, but the laws regarding taxation—laws which are in course of constant change.

Whether Vice-Chancellor Bird's law be good or bad, his facts are false—are not facts at all, but gross, unwarranted inventions of his own.

In concluding this remarkable opinion, Vice-Chancellor Bird alludes (for he probably felt that he could not entirely ignore it), to a legal decision rendered when slavery was as fully recognized by the laws of the United States, and of many of the several states, as private ownership of land is now—a decision in which the court upheld a bequest for the dissemination of anti-slavery literature. He says he has sought to bring my books within that opinion, but has not been able to do so "for the reasons given"—i. e., that they contain allegations that "private property in land is robbery."

Did Vice-Chancellor Bird ever see or hear of an anti-slavery book, paper, tract, lecture or speech that did not contain the assertion that slavery was robbery? Did not all the anti-slavery literature team with such declarations, and with assertions that the slave trade was piracy, that slave owners were criminals, and that those who attempted to recapture what under the laws of the United States was legal property were kidnappers and man stealers; that they and all who abetted or encouraged them, even though acting by direct authority of the laws and the express commands of the courts, were guilty of far more heinous offenses against the moral law than simple theft, and that there was a higher law that made the constitution and laws of the United States null and void whenever they came in conflict with it?

And yet he declares that while the law would permit bequests for the dissemination of such literature, it will not permit the dissemination of books containing the passages with regard to property in land which he has quoted.

Governor Hill gave a hearing on the electoral reform bill in Albany last Friday. Charles L. Crain and Alderman Forster opposed the bill on behalf of Tammany, and Assemblyman Charles T. Saxton, the Rev. Dr. McGlynn, Michael Clarke, secretary of the anti-poverty society, Peter R. Gatens of the New York committee of the united labor party, Judge Shannon and myself spoke briefly in its favor. The objections urged were as to matters of trivial detail, but although the governor declared himself in favor of the principle of the bill, such objections seemed to lie in his mind. There is no mistaking, however, the popular sentiment in favor of the reform. All the labor associations of New York that have met during the week have passed resolutions urging Governor Hill to sign it and have sent telegrams and letters to him to that effect. The meantime what is substantially the same measure has passed both houses of the Massachusetts legislature, with a few unimportant amendments in the assembly, which require its going back to the senate, and will doubtless be again passed by the senate and promptly signed by Governor Ames.

What is left of the Twenty-third district association of the united labor party formally expelled me on Monday night on charges of abandoning the great principle of the single tax for the lesser one of free trade, of having spoken of the party as a paper organization, and of supporting President Cleveland upon inspiration from Washington. The *Star* has a local article intimating that Dr. McGlynn is also likely to find his room wanted in what is now left of the united labor party. Mr. Gaybert Barnes, the secretary, has denied the report which the *Star* gives of a difference between himself and Dr. McGlynn, and it is probable that the only ground for it is the fact, asserted by other prominent men in what is left of the united labor party, that the nomination of a separate candidate at Cincinnati was by Dr. McGlynn's influence and against the views of Mr. Barnes. As for the talk of getting rid of Dr. McGlynn, it is suggestive of the difficulties that the doctor is not unlikely to find in his political way.

The financial power in keeping together what is left of the united labor party seems now to be Colonel James J. Coogan, who is reported to have paid the expenses of most of the delegates that went from here to Cincinnati. Colonel Coogan is a man of great wealth and strong ambition. He has not only made a fortune for himself in the furniture business, but has inherited, through his wife, a great tract of real estate in the upper part of the city, which is now improving and which has enormously increased in value. He is in fact one of the principal owners of Manhattan Island, and the estate which he controls will ere long, if it does not already, rank among the first in the list which begins with the Astors. He is, moreover, a strong protectionist.

Colonel Coogan has for some years ardently desired to be mayor of New York, and there is no reason why he should not be, in as ability, education and business reputation he is quite up to the ordinary standard of mayors. The only way to get to be mayor of New York under our present system of elections and consequent machines is to spend a great deal of money. Colonel Coogan is an extremely liberal man; in many respects, perhaps, the most liberal man in the city, and makes no secret of his willingness to spend as much, or more, than any candidate for mayor has ever invested in politics. He is, of course, not particular as to what ticket he runs on, since what he wants is to "get there," and proposes, as it is understood, to use what is left of the united labor party as a pawn upon his chess board, thinking that its nomination will help him to get the republican nomination on an understanding that the united labor boxes, on election day, shall run out the republican presidential ticket. There would be no great sacrifice in this, as, from the talk of what is now left of the united labor party in New York, its members are bent, as their primary object in politics, on defeating Mr. Cleveland, and would naturally be inclined to cast their votes for the republican candidate, rather than throw them away for Cowdrey. Colonel Coogan, however, is a strong Catholic, and from his affiliations would naturally get a large Catholic vote, were he to run. For this reason he might think Dr. McGlynn's continued presence in the united labor party rather an encumbrance than an advantage, in which case it is quite conceivable that his money would tell in the little united labor machine for much more than Dr. McGlynn's popularity.

One thing is certain. These little side-show parties inevitably degenerate into little machines for local trading, and Dr. McGlynn, with his chivalrous but impractical idea of standing up and being counted, is likely before election comes to find what is left of the united labor party engaged in transactions which will make his connection with it intolerable to him.

HENRY GEORGE.

The Liquor Traffic and the Single Tax.
After the destruction of the "protective" tariff I suppose the next effort of single tax men in the field of national politics should be the abolition of the internal revenue. I, for my part, am not in favor of imposing a fine even on what I believe to be misdirected industry, especially as other fields of industry will be more and more opened by the gradual fall of monopolies. Nor do I consider that the poor man would be taxed more justly through the price of his liquor than through the price of his other articles of consumption, although I believe he would be better off without the liquor and hope he will learn to do without it.

What I do want—in common, I think, with all prohibitionists that are not of the crank order—is, first, the downfall of the "run power in politics" second, the extermination of the open saloon. Electoral reform, with the abolition of the internal revenue, should accomplish the first. The open saloon, which exists only to tempt the weak and unwary, will gradually fall before an enlightened public sentiment working legitimately through local option or by direct state legislation. Meanwhile how can its admitted evils be better checked than by methods in harmony with the principles of the single tax? Before moving against the internal revenue we must have a solution of that problem, for the revenue will be defended not only by those who have monopoly opportunities under it, but also by those temperance people who believe, as I believed two years ago, that revenue and license taxes are at once a legitimate mode of raising funds for public use and a real check on the consumption of liquor.

N. H. WHITNEY BROWN.

A Word for the Single Tax League.

POMONA, Cal.—A few months since I was a protectionist, "though," in the language of Little Buttercup, "I could never tell why." I read "Progress and Poverty," and that settled the matter. I watch anxiously for the arrival of THE STANDARD every week and devour every line.

I heartily endorse the constitution of the Single Tax League. The single tax men would be playing into the hands of the republican party by placing a candidate in the field. God deliver us from a republican victory just at this time!

ALBERT CALDWELL.

The Origin of Boreotism.

An English paper, the Norfolk News, has discovered the earliest boycott on record. It was proclaimed by the council of Tours in 1163 in the following words:

We command all bishops and priests to keep a watchful eye upon the heretics, and to forbid all men, under pain of excommunication, to harbor, or assist, or trade with the same, that so, through the force of the benefits of society, they may be forced to repent of their error. And whosoever shall attempt to oppose the decree shall be smitten with the same anathema.

ANTI-POVERTY IN ENGLAND.

A REMARKABLE CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANS IN LONDON.

Clergymen, Members of Parliament and Other Influential Men Gather in the City Temple and Discuss the Problem of Poverty—Stirring Speeches—Present Social Conditions Denounced as Anti-Christian—Complete Advocacy of the Single Tax Doctrine—Rev. Dr. Parker in the Chair.

A recent issue of the London Christian Commonwealth contains a lengthy report of one of the most important meetings yet held in Great Britain in furtherance of the anti-poverty movement—a conference of representative Christians to consider the cause of poverty and to point out its remedy. The meeting was held in the City temple, and was attended by a large number of clergymen and other public and influential men. Rev. Dr. Parker presided. Rev. George Brooks, editor of the Christian Commonwealth, was first introduced. He said:

The projectors of the conference have long been deeply convinced that, in spite of the widespread interest which is now being manifested in regard to the social situation, the cause of poverty has not received from the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ that degree of consideration which its gravity demands, and that consequently the practical effort put forth to alleviate that condition has not so far produced much of a fruitful result. This has been as "the burden of the Lord" upon the hearts of those who have taken the initiative in convening this assembly. They have long desired such an occasion as this, when the whole question might be boldly faced, frankly discussed and vigorously handled. In the realization of this aim we have succeeded, for probably no more influential gathering than this has been held on the social problem for years. We are here for conference, discussion, mutual enlightenment and encouragement, and it is hoped that there will go forth from this meeting such an expression of opinion as will guide you in any further steps which might be found necessary to take. On one point, however, we ventured to express a conviction which we firmly hold, and it is that a social condition which produces such results as we see around us is largely artificial, and calls for immediate and radical treatment at the hands of the church of Christ. If the direct practical result of that conference shall be to awaken the disciples of Christ to their duty, and to organize the most Christian opinion which exists on these matters so as to bring it to bear more immediately and influentially on the misery and poverty which surround us, we who have convened it will have abundant reward.

The first speaker was the Rev. Newman Hall, LL.B., who attributed the prevalence of poverty to intemperance, and announced that if the government would take the matter in hand and close public houses, thereby diminishing the drink traffic, there would be a very large increase in useful industry and a very great diminution of poverty.

William Saunders, late M. P. for East Hull, and one of the foremost men in the single tax movement in Great Britain, next spoke on the subject, "Unjust legislation the chief cause of poverty."

The drift of his address was that hitherto our legislation, made by the privileged classes in their own interests, bore most unjustly and almost crushingly on industry. He specified three methods in which this was illustrated, viz., as regards taxation, wages and the right of idleness. In regard to taxation, he pointed out that the taxation of the country had been so arranged as to fall very heavily upon the toiling masses and very lightly upon the upper classes. In proof of which he said that £1,000 was spent in land tax, but only £100 in taxes on the building houses it paid £15 in taxes. The greatest of industries—agriculture—was taxed fifty per cent, not for the benefit of the public, but for the benefit of the idle land owners. As regards wages, he showed that while an ordinary postman in London received 4d per hour, many civil servants were paid 2s per hour. Of course one man might be worth 18 times as much as another man, but he (Mr. Saunders) failed to see how that could apply to whole classes of men. While industry was paid, the idle classes were heavily mulcted in the matter of rent, mainly again for the benefit of privileged classes. Thus working people in London, living in one room, were paying 2s per week for rent, 2s of this to the ground landlord, 1s to the builder, and 1s to the rates. Was it surprising that on one hand there was a want of employment and on the other a want of accommodation with all the evils of overcrowding?

Mr. Walter Hazell declared that emigration was the chief remedy for poverty, referring to his own experience in sending emigrants to Australia and Canada, where they had met with success and thrived.

The next speaker, Sir M. Burroughs, whose special subject was "Causes of poverty among the industrial classes," said:

To find the true cause of the prevailing poverty among the working classes is the most pressing problem of the hour, and the removal of that cause will be the first step towards a solution of the great reform. Both divine and natural law decree that wealth is produced only by industry. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." "He that will not sow shall not eat." If a ship be wrecked on an uninhabited island who will have houses, clothing, food? Naturally those who build, weave and sow, while those who will not trouble themselves to work will naturally be supplied.

Both natural and divine law have evidently been supplanted in this world by human laws, which reverse the natural order of things, because we see all round us, and that cause will be the first step towards a solution of the great reform. Both divine and natural law decree that wealth is produced only by industry. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." "He that will not sow shall not eat." If a ship be wrecked on an uninhabited island who will have houses, clothing, food? Naturally those who build, weave and sow, while those who will not trouble themselves to work will naturally be supplied.

Both natural and divine law have evidently been supplanted in this world by human laws, which reverse the natural order of things, because we see all round us, and that cause will be the first step towards a solution of the great reform. Both divine and natural law decree that wealth is produced only by industry. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." "He that will not sow shall not eat." If a ship be wrecked on an uninhabited island who will have houses, clothing, food? Naturally those who build, weave and sow, while those who will not trouble themselves to work will naturally be supplied.

erations will think of us as we think of those that have gone before. As they pitifully read the history of these times, and consider the present absurd social conditions, the superstitious which sustain them, and the various wise opinions which are given by good people as to the causes of poverty among the industrious and of wealth among the idle, they will laugh at our folly.

Some are afraid to make inquiries into the problem in question, for fear of being considered reformers, but our great example, Jesus Christ, and also his disciples, were reformers. Some are so afraid of interfering with vested interests that they will not for a moment consider if the "vested interests" would not be greatly benefited by a change in human laws which would bring them into harmony with divine law and common sense. Christ's pure commandment is, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." Let us not fear that houses, food, and all the necessities of life shall be given if we will but seek first the kingdom of God.

As idleness tends to poverty, and industry to wealth, a state of society in which opposite conditions prevail must evidently be wrong. We may leave entirely out of the question those who justly enjoy the fruits of the industry of their parents, or who have come into inheritances of wealth earned by industry, for that we believe to be their rightful property.

Let us consider solely as pertaining to this question, the reprehensible communistic and socialistic state of our present society, whereby the law appropriates the earnings of the industrious and divides them among the idle. There surely cannot be a worse system of distribution of wealth than this.

If the principle to render to every man that which is his due is to apply to the state as well as to the individual, then there must be some great changes in the distribution of wealth; if the state is to be the distributor, the individual will receive the results of his industry, and the state will tax the unearned increment which is created by the growth of the population and wealth of the community, and leave the individual to his own resources. It has been pointed out as a remarkable coincidence and inevitable result that as a community increases in numbers and wealth there is a sure and proportionate increase in land value. It is on the principle that as a man will give everything for his life he will give all he can spare of his possessions for that which is essential to life, viz., air, water and earth.

Does it not appear as if it was the intent of the creator that these values which the public create should be taxed for the public expenses, thus fully supplying them with public requirements of roads, schools, etc.?

Is it right that these values should be given away to the public, and the individual who creates them be left to starve?

If this commonwealth be given to individuals they are unduly exalted and placed beyond the necessity of labor, while at the same time it becomes necessary to tax the industrious in various ways, so that the individual who creates the wealth is left to starve.

If improvements or the fruits of industry in any form are taxed, employment is hindered or stopped. The tax is added to the cost of the production, making production dearer and preventing many from using the product in question who would otherwise use it. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced. If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or its interest, it will be no longer produced.

If the tax on any production be so great as to absorb its value, or if it absorb its profits or

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
10 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.

One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Signed at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient postage is sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscriptions at every postoffice in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who are unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1888.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

SLAVERY AT HOME AND ABROAD.

"Slave life in London!" "A terrible indictment against free trade employers of pauper labor!" "What we may come to if a united effort is not made to protect labor!" "Unprotected English workers!" These head lines, well displayed, stared warningly at the reader of last Sunday's Press, our bright but unbalanced protection contemporary. They were intended for the double purpose of calling attention to a truly sickening story from the columns of the London Globe, in which the life of the "sweater's victim" is graphically portrayed, and of making it appear that such horrors as the article describes are peculiar to free trade countries and will be experienced in this "land of the free" if the doctrine of protection does not prevail. But we need go no further than the columns of the Press itself to find that such conditions already exist here, despite the tariff protection which we enjoy. Our contemporary has not yet described the life of New York "victims of the sweater," though investigations of other newspapers give assurance that the London horror can be paralleled here; but it has described the condition of a more opulent labor class—hotel servants, and in the very number of the Press in which appears the description of the awful condition of "unprotected English workers" (who, by the way, were Polish Jews) the condition of a still more opulent labor class—hotel waiters, as well as that of servants, is described.

These descriptions of New York life might be headed, "Slave Life in New York!" "A terrible indictment against protection employers of pauper labor!" "What New Jersey may come to if a united effort is not made to protect labor!" but it is evident that they did not pass under the eye of the politico-economic editor, which accounts probably for the free trade flavor of the facts.

Week before last we made liberal extracts from the Press's first article on the slave life of hotel servants. Since the publication of that article others have appeared, some of them from the eloquent pen of Mrs. Robert P. Porter, the editor's wife, in which particular attention is paid to the food upon which these workers must subsist, as in the first article particular attention was paid to their sleeping accommodations. Here we are told is a girl—the Press calls her Bridget for convenience—who has just arrived from the realms of free trade, where "she has always been poor, but the air of heaven has never been measured out to her in feet and inches."

She has the strength and good spirits of youth, and to enter service in "the land of the free" through the doors of a magnificent hotel seems to open a paradise of hope and prosperity before her. Bridget gets a place and is put to work from twelve to fifteen and eighteen hours at a stretch. It may be scrubbing or bedroom work, ironing, washing linen or dishes. Hard work all of it, and if Bridget has a good constitution, it will give her a hearty appetite for her breakfast. If she is not strong, there will be no appetite, but exhaustion makes her anxious to eat that she may go on. Here is the menu of the first meal of the day that is to keep these human mills running:

Ends of loaves with crusts.
"Patent butter."
Coffee "a la beguater."

Before Bridget gets this she has, if a scrub girl, worked four hours; if a chambermaid, two. She is Irish and makes the best of the bad fare. She is more inclined to joke than to sulk, and any way she will make up for it at dinner, she thinks. As noon approaches, Bridget is more and more bothered by the sinking sensation that she has had all the morning, and looks forward with eagerness to the meal that will enable her to pick up after flourishing an iron or tossing mattresses for half a day. Anything will taste good and the summons is eagerly answered. The appetizing bill of fare is composed of the following dishes: The standard hotel plate which the steward dignifies by the name of "stew," but more popularly known as "swill." This stew is composed of the refuse of the dining room after the waiters have picked it over for their own dinner. If asked to analyze it Professor Doremus himself would be staggered, for it is literally all manner of things diluted with grease and water. Bread for dinner is that burned or soured in baking; potatoes with their skins on; cold water complete the feast. Pudding and vegetables are unknown, and there is not a hotel in this city which gives its help a decent piece of roast for their dinner. When Bridget sits down to the table her heart fails her. The stew is offensive to the eyes, and meat, if there is any, is offensive to the nose, so she hurriedly eats a potato or two, a piece of broken bread, swallows a glass of water and returns to her work.

When 10 o'clock comes Bridget is thoroughly worn out, and feels as if the soft side of a plank would be a luxurious bed. She hurries to the common room up among the chimneys, or, worse still, down under the sidewalk, and is soon in her own particular bunk or sharing

a bed with another girl. There is a bad smell, and she pulls the blanket over her head to avoid it.

Soon she is in a heavy sleep that lasts until midnight, when she begins to pitch and turn and mutter. She is vaguely aware that the air is choking, that horrid things are crawling about her, and that the other girls are muttering and turning, too. A concluding nightmare is banished by a summons to get up, and, with aching head and fevered brain, she hurries to dress and resume eternal toil. The end of it all is a stoop, a cough, the hospital and the grave.

If protection offers any advantages to workers it is quite certain that Bridget might be pardoned for not having discovered it.

A housekeeper of a Broadway hotel gives, through Mrs. Porter, the result of her observation and experience, as follows:

To-day I had to discharge two poor Irish girls because they had complained of the food that was given them, and which was too vile for even an animal. They had come of respectable parents, but arrived in this country in a penniless condition, and were obliged to go to work in a hotel and put up with the worst kind of treatment, but they didn't murmur until made ill by eating the tainted meat furnished the servants. They then rebelled and went to the proprietor of the hotel, who cursed them and told them to go back to the table at which they had been eating. He then commanded me to throw them into the street if they didn't eat the meat. The poor things wept bitterly when they were told of the proprietor's last orders. Although I pleaded with him to continue them in his service he refused, and with an oath said if I didn't obey his orders he would kick me out also.

The housekeeper of a hotel is placed in an undesirable position. She is supposed to obey the boss and close her eyes to any injustice that he may inflict on the poor girls. If she doesn't do as he says why she receives her discharge, and others can easily be obtained who will fill her place.

The cleaning and laundry women suffer the most. The former are required to be at work at 4 a. m., and the latter at about the same hour. The chambermaids go on at 6 a. m. The laundry girls are obliged to work until 10 or 11 o'clock at night about four days in the week. When there is much ironing to do the ironers are obliged to work until midnight.

There is no slavery that could be compared with that which is undergone by the laundry girls. I have had many of them carried from the suffocating laundry room in a dead faint. During the summer months the work is something terrible. And it is of quite frequent occurrence to have the girls faint, as they don't have proper food or nourishment and are overworked.

The food the help in some of the hotels gets is unfit for even the dogs to eat. It is only the heads of the departments and the pantry and kitchen girls who get food that is any way fit to eat. The latter get it because the hotel proprietors can't help themselves. I don't mean to infer that the women or men expert dainties or food that compares with that served to the hotel guests, but what they do want and require in order to have strength to perform their work is a piece of sound meat occasionally and not meat that is tainted and diseased.

I do not exaggerate in the least when I say that I know that diseased meat is given the servants to eat in a number of the New York hotels. It was only a fortnight ago that all the servants in a hotel not far from the one where I am employed refused to eat the meat given them, and the entire force of servants got up from the table. The proprietor came down and ordered them all out of the dining room. Those who would afford it went out to a cheap restaurant and got their supper, while those who couldn't afford it went to bed hungry.

When they discharge a poor girl who has no money nor friends they say to the heads of the departments: "We can run this hotel without them, and we can get plenty of greenhorns who will take their places."

I am willing to make affidavit to the statement that I have known girls to become ill from overwork and poor food, and then go to their friends or to the hospital to die. I can remember more than a score of just such cases in the hotel that I have been employed in for the past few years. It is a living death for the poor girls in some of the hotels, who come to this country, and even with proper treatment oftentimes take ill owing to the change in climate.

I wonder if the board of health is aware that in some of the hotels on Broadway there are from seventeen to twenty women sleeping in a small room. If they don't take some action in the matter before the heat of July and August comes there will be more deaths than there were last year among the hotel employees.

In summing up her investigations, Mrs. Porter plaintively says:

You see it is the same everywhere, this universal cry of "Give us food or we perish." These daughters of toil do not ask to be fed on turtle soup with a golden spoon, nor even to fare as well as help in families. All they demand is plain but nourishing food that will enable them to do their work well, and without becoming premature old women or cases for a public hospital.

But they do not get the nourishing food, and the reason is that it does not concern the proprietor to lose any of his help because he "can get plenty of greenhorns who will take their places." What worse than folly—how nearly criminal it is—to pretend that free trade causes poverty in pent up England, when conditions like these confront us on this vast American continent.

Pursuing its investigations, the Press has learned that hotel waiters, those enviable gentlemen who get wages from the proprietor and "tips" from the public, are not the nabobs they are supposed to be. There are more people wanting work than there are open opportunities for work; so if the waiter gets "tips," he must take lower wages, and his "tips" and wages together cannot long be more than what waiters generally are willing to work for. Referring to this subject, one of the waiters interviewed by the Press reporter, says:

It has become a matter of jeer and gibe that a waiter is a shark after tips and fees from the public; but if the public only knew that our anxiety for tips is an anxiety to give bread and butter and a home to our families, they might sometimes excuse a man if he expects a little. It is a fact notorious among us that our wages are actually cut down low because of the tips which we receive. The hotel men profit as much as we do by the tips, for they get our services at a less rate because of them. A head waiter will be appointed in a hotel and at once there is a scramble to cut down expenses. He desires

to make himself popular, and cuts us. We are then obliged to depend on the public for our living, practically, through tips.

But it is not alone that waiters must piece out their scant wages with tips, of which waiters complain. The same man said, and others corroborate him:

That, however, is not by any means our greatest grievance. We are treated more like dogs in the matter of food than we are like Christians. Day after day there is put in the swill barrel remnants of choice food from the table that would feed many families and would be most grateful to us, but, hungry as we may be, we dare not touch a morsel of it. If we did we would be fined and be told not to do it again in a tone that would be suited to telling a man that he would be hanged if he dared to do it. A second offense means a discharge. We are on duty fourteen hours a day on an average. We are supposed to get our breakfasts when we arrive, but time after time we have gone and found the tables bare, and have been told that if we didn't like that we might leave. And then for our dinner—that is simply disgusting. It is fitly prepared.

The dish of mystery—the hotel stew—is thrown at us. The tables are not cleaned, the food is of the vilest kind, while, as I said, barrels full of good food is thrown away, and then we are asked to eat what is fit for no Christian.

Get any waiter and let him feel that he can speak to you with confidence, and he will confirm what I say. If the public wish to corroborate it let any of those who go regularly to the dining room of any of the hotels, and who have gotten to know any of the waiters, just inquire for themselves, and they, too, can learn the truth. Our hours are too long and we are practically starved.

If some of the food that is left from the orders of the guests were given us for our dinner instead of being thrown into the swill barrel we would be comparatively happy. People may laugh sometimes, but I tell you that it is hard for a man who is hungry to have to throw good food into a swill barrel without touching it, and then be invited to go to a meal not fit for a Christian. We get nothing to eat but the refuse, and that not served to us clean.

Then, again, the hours are entirely too long. I work one day fourteen hours and the next day sixteen hours, and our watches are so arranged that the only off time we have is a few hours in the afternoon every second day—just time enough to go home and change linen and shave and get back.

The Press would have it understood that the degradation of hotel servants and waiters is due to the inhumanity or negligence of hotel proprietors, and that a remedy may be found in bringing the force of public opinion to bear upon the hearts of these men. To a slight extent this may be effectual, and in its effort the Press has THE STANDARD'S best wishes and most fervent prayers. But the benefit can be but slight and must constantly depend upon the good will of the hotel men as against pressure of self interest and business maxims, for the fundamental reason for such treatment of hotel servants is not that hotel proprietors are more inhuman or negligent than other men, but because the dependence of working people generally makes all labor contracts of the jug handle order. When the man who has work to give has but to raise his finger to attract a mob of workers, and men who want work to do must beg and scramble for a chance, the worker cannot make terms; and in those conditions, if the employer is kind, it is the kindness of the humane slave owner, not the courtesy of equals to equals.

And even if the lot of the hotel servant were meliorated by exciting a sentiment of condescending goodness on the part of his employer, that would not benefit the man or woman who works by the piece, or the day or the week, in crowded stores or factories, or in cellar and attic "homes." These people can be helped only by open and debasing charity, or by sweeping away artificial conditions that destroy natural independence. The latter mode is the true, the only effectual reform. That would build up men; the other makes servile dependents and sturdy beggars.

And one of these artificial conditions is "protection," which protects by prohibiting freedom of contract, and knows no other lawful way of extending its benefits from the monopolist whose fortune it fosters, to the serf whose labor he commands, than by soliciting public opinion to compel him to be kind to his "help."

Free trade is the channel that leads to freedom; and freedom secures equality of opportunity and consent in contracting. Given these, and no man needs tariff protection or will accept humiliating charity.

But we are not confined to the news columns of the Press for proof that the London poor have no advantage over ours in the matter of poverty. Here is what the special commissioner of the New York Tribune says about the way the work women of New York live under the lash of their sweaters:

In a room ten feet square, low ceiled, and lighted by but one window whose panes were crusted with the dirt of a generation, seven women sat at work. Three machines were the principal furniture. A small stove burned fiercely, the close smell of red hot iron hardly dominating the fouler one of sinks and reeking sewer gas. Piles of cloaks were on the floor, and the women, white and wan, with cavernous eyes and hands more akin to a skeleton's than to flesh and blood, bent over the garments that would pass from this loathsome place saturated with the invisible filth furnished as air. There were handsome cloaks, lined with quilted silk or satin, trimmed with fur or sealskin, and retailed at prices from thirty to seventy-five dollars. A teapot stood at the back of the stove, some cups, and a loaf of bread, with a lump of streaky butter, were on a small table absorbing their portion also of filth. An inner room, a mere closet, dark and even fouler than the outer one, held the bed; a mattress, black with age, lying upon the floor. Here such a rest as might be had was taken when the sixteen hours of work ended—sixteen hours of toil unrelieved by one gleam of hope or cheer; the net result of this accumulated and ever accumulating misery being \$3.50 a week. Two women using their utmost diligence could finish one cloak a day, receiving from the "sweater," through whose hands all must come, fifty cents each for a

toil unequalled by any form of labor under the sun, unless it be that of the haggard wretches dressed in men's clothes, but counted as female laborers, in Belgian mines.

It will be hard for the Press to find, in its English exchanges, any story of wretchedness among the sweater's victims in London to match this narrative of Helen Campbell's. And these horrors are not confined to New York or to the "thickly settled" Atlantic states. In another column of this issue of THE STANDARD we tell in brief the story of the working women of Minneapolis who are striving by combination and appeals to public sympathy to improve their wretched wages of six cents each for making shirts. We commend it to the attention of the Press.

Freedom of opportunity is the only remedy for these things, and freedom of opportunity comprehends not only freedom of opportunity to trade, but also freedom of opportunity to produce from or upon the land. Looking at Ireland through the large end of its spy glass, the Press vaguely sees the importance of equal rights to the land. But only vaguely. The landlords of Ireland own the land of Ireland, it says; but it immediately qualifies the acknowledgment with an utterly inconsistent declaration: "The land is theirs, but the law has the right to define the uses they may make of it! The people have some rights in the land!" And pray what rights have the people in the land if the landlords own it? If John owns his hat, what moral right has the law to define the uses he may make of it, and what rights have the people in that hat?

The fact is that this qualification which the Press makes of the landlord's alleged right, is a distorted recognition of the truth that all men have a natural right to land, a truth which the Press, either for prudential reasons or because its vision is not yet clear, does not express in its fullness. In their struggle "for this right to live upon the land which God created for them," it says of the Irish, they have "the sympathy of the American people, the Press included;" but it chokes to regard their "right to live upon the land which God created for them" as "subject to such reasonable rent as they can afford to pay." Did God place a rent charge on Irish land when he created it for the Irish people?

And now listen to this magnificent peroration from the Press:

When God created the earth he gave the fishes a home in the waters; to the birds of the air he gave resting places on the trees. It was surely his intent that man should live upon the land. He made the earth ample for all his creatures, and he never intended that a thousand men should exercise the absolute right to consign five millions to emigration or starvation.

No; "he never intended that a thousand men should exercise the absolute right to consign five millions to emigration or starvation." He only intended, according to the Press's distorted conception of an eternal truth, that a thousand men should exercise the qualified right to consign five millions to emigration or starvation, unless they pay "such reasonable rent as they can afford to pay."

THE ANDERSON BILL.

If there is any real desire in congress to bring the Pacific railroad conspirators to justice, the bill introduced on April 23 by Mr. Anderson of Iowa will receive an earnest support. The facts stated in the majority and minority reports of the Pacific railway commission are clearly presented in the preamble, which also makes the new and important point that the time given the companies for the payment of their debts is among the rights, grants and privileges obtained by them from the United States, and has, like all other privileges and franchises, been forfeited through frauds practiced by the managers and the numerous failures of the companies to meet their obligations. This seems to dispose of the claim that congress can do nothing now to bring the conspirators to justice, but must stand idle and see the remaining property alienated or impaired until the indorsed bonds fall due, its only alternative being a new bargain with the men who have frequently betrayed it by which they will secure a new term of from thirty to fifty years in which to tax the business of the country and to continue their robbery of the government.

The one thing of supreme importance at this session of congress is the prevention of this scheme. Ordinarily one congress can be depended on to remedy the blunders of a preceding congress, but under the unfortunate and undemocratic ruling of the supreme court in the Dartmouth case it is possible in cases of contract, like this, for one legislature to tie the hands of its successors, and the scheme to extend the time for the payment of the Pacific railroad bonds is such a scheme. It should, therefore, be resisted by means of every possible parliamentary device by the opponents of monopoly in the present congress, and if the Anderson bill accomplishes nothing more, it will serve an admirable purpose if it shall become the rallying point of those congressmen who are determined to prevent the new lease of power now sought by the Pacific railroad ring.

Mr. Anderson's bill does not go so far as we could wish. Instead of providing for the acquisition by the federal government of these roads, built by its money and credit, it merely requires the appointment of receivers for the several companies; but this leaves the door open for wiser action in the people's interests a few years hence, when the principal of the bonds falls due, and is, for that reason alone, greatly superior to any other proposal for dealing with the pending question. Any measure that takes the management of these roads

out of the hands of the men who hold them in trust for people whose claim to own them rests on robbery and fraud is a good one; but in view of the threatened extension, such a measure becomes one of vital importance.

Thus far the tariff debate has pushed the Anderson bill, along with many other measures, into the background; but it is to be hoped that before the session closes the bill will either be passed or else be made an efficient obstacle to the success of the inexcusable legislation recommended by a majority of the Pacific railway commissioners.

UNFETTERED TAXATION.

The old argument that indirect taxation is to be commended because it is unfettered by the people has cropped out in the course of the recent tariff debate, and was boldly met, in at least one instance, by Mr. Breckinridge's bold declaration of his own preference for direct taxation. The argument is as unsound as would be one in favor of an odorless sewer gas on the ground that its victims would inhale it unconsciously. Such an argument for indirect taxation might be sound if urged upon a tyrannical government which has reason to deceive its subjects' as to the weight of the burden imposed upon them, but it is worse than foolishness when addressed to a democratic people whose duty, as well as privilege, it is to know and scrutinize the expenditures of their government. The evil results of unfettered taxation are admirably set forth in an essay on democracy by the late Charles O'Connor.

The evil art of the politician who calls himself a statesman consists in perceiving and acting upon the absurd preference for being robbed exclusively through the secret and unfettered instrumentality of duties, exactions and the like, rather than paying directly moderate exactions in the form of taxation. This weakness of the citizen forms the strength of these evil counselors who misgovern the state. It must be corrected or intolerable evils will ensue. In the action of congress, of the state legislatures, and of the municipalities, official extravagance has been proved to a shocking extent by allowing these unfettered methods of raising revenue, borrowing money for long terms on the public credit being the most prominent. Unless the numerous governments intertwined in the American system can be checked in this career, the system itself must ere long perish. This cannot be accomplished otherwise than by absolutely forbidding all methods of obtaining revenue or funds for outlay other than immediate taxation. The use of these other methods is the root of every avoidable governmental abuse that exists in the United States, or that, in the nature of things, can exist in a country blessed with a democratic constitution. If taxes form the only allowed sources of expenditure, frugality will ensue, and under the shadow of frugality mischiefs can scarcely prevail.

The argument here is perfectly sound, and it is as effective against a tariff for revenue only as against a protective tariff. There is absolutely no justification or excuse for such a system, and the debate now begun will make this clear to a rapidly increasing number of our people. No such vital question as that of slavery can again obscure the great problem of relieving the people from onerous taxation; and now that the agitation has been resumed, it must ultimately reach its only logical result, the release of all products of labor from taxation, and dependence on land values, created by the people, as the sole and sufficient source of public revenue. The tendency that way is manifest, and the argument quoted from Mr. O'Connor is frequently found in the records of the old debates on the tariff question. The advocates of the single tax who fail to recognize the tendency of the tariff agitation to add to their number are blind to the logic and the facts of the situation.

MR. COX ON THE TARIFF.

One of the best speeches in the whole course of the tariff debate in the house was that delivered by the Hon. S. S. Cox of this city. Though it abounded in the wit and humor that characterize all of Mr. Cox's utterances, and frequently called forth roars of laughter from both sides of the house, it was nevertheless a serious argument for tariff reform, as was shown by the extracts from it printed in the last number of THE STANDARD. In no particular is it more worthy of commendation than in its clear assertion of the truth that any valuable, practical legislation must be based on sound principle.

"Very pretty in theory, but it will not work in practice," is one of the phrases frequently used by the protectionists in their comments on free trade, and of late some professed adherents of the single tax have formed a habit of declaring that though that doctrine leads ultimately to free trade that a tariff is still necessary for practical purposes. Referring to the protectionist criticism Mr. Cox said:

These maxims, Mr. Chairman, may seem abstract. They may be placed within the category of doctrine; but I hold now, as I have ever held here, that there can be no wise, practical legislation unless we deduct it from, or find it crystallized in, correct theory. The sneer against scholasticism and doctrinaires come from ignorance of the philosophy and economy of legislation.

Nothing could be more true, and in this, as in many other parts of his speech, Mr. Cox demonstrated that he has been a close student of economic science, and that he is one who appreciates the necessity of such study in fitting a man to grapple with the problems that must henceforth for many years occupy the attention of all who aim to win for themselves the name of statesmen.

Mr. Cox's speech was as courageous as it was able. He boldly met the silly protectionist chatter about the Cobden club by eloquent tribute to Richard Cobden and his fellow free traders and a eulogy of the club named in his honor. How broad the contrast between such a course and that of

the cowards who meet this stupid cry by denouncing the men whose opinions they share and whose hospitality they gladly accept when in England.

Mr. Cox has chosen the part of a laughing philosopher in congress, but those who enjoy his wit sadly mistake the man if they fail to see beneath his mirth the serious purpose, the ability and the courage that characterize his speeches on this and other subjects of real importance to the welfare of the country.

Certain business men of Los Angeles, California, have objected to the action of the Southern Pacific and Atchison railroads in giving outside towns and cities the same low rates on through freights as is enjoyed by Los Angeles. From the standpoint of the protectionist, this objection is very near sighted. Why should Los Angeles want to get outside goods at low rates of transportation? Do not these merchants know that the more it costs to bring outside goods into Los Angeles the more prosperous and happy her people will be? What are these Los Angeles merchants doing but playing right into the hands of other towns? If foreign goods are admitted into Los Angeles at low rates of freight, while other towns are charged high rates, these other towns will soon grow to be magnificent cities with home markets for home producers, while Los Angeles, overwhelmed with cheap goods from outside, will have no industries in which her citizens can engage, and will die the death of the free trader. And yet the residents of surrounding towns do not appreciate the kindness toward them of the Los Angeles merchants. The Pomona (Cal.) Times, a protection paper, regards the objection of the Los Angeles merchants as "rather cool," and says it simply means that "they ask the railroads to 'hold down' our local merchants so that they will be obliged to sell at prices which will force the people to go to Los Angeles to trade." Why in the world should the people of Pomona want to go to Los Angeles to trade? Why should they want to go anywhere to trade? Has not the Times been able yet to teach them the wickedness of trade and the essential goodness of making for yourself whatever you want?

SOCIETY NOTES.

Between the Wallace testimonial, the races, the coaching club parade and a wedding or two of some interest, the members of fashionable circles in New York (or those of them who are still in town) managed to have a comfortable time last week. Not many of them were seen at the Metropolitan opera house on Monday night, yet a sufficient number turned out to give the gathering a fashionable air. The bad weather, cold, damp and dreary, kept many pretty dresses away from Cedarhurst, but enough bright colors were worn to make the starting place on Tuesday and Friday pretty effective. (New York Tribune.)

Sixteen thousand children under five years of age are said to die every year in New York city. Last summer 4,119 were carried off, and nearly a thousand in a single week. "I think that this year will see a great depression in all branches of labor; in fact, almost a complete paralysis in many branches. That, of course, means great suffering and privation for the poor. It is a very sad prospect, but I can see no remedy just at present, under the existing state of things." (Andrew Carnegie in New York Tribune.)

One of the most delightful outings of the summer has been planned by Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Carnegie, who sailed last week for England. They, in company with Mr. and Mrs. James G. Blaine, Miss Margaret Blaine, the Rev. Charles A. Eaton and Mr. and Mrs. Henry Phillips, jr., will take a little out of London and will make a trip of over 700 miles along the east coast of England and Scotland, stopping at all the interesting places. The journey, it is expected, will last over five weeks, and it will end in Cluney castle, Mr. Carnegie's Scotch home, where the party will be entertained upon their arrival, and where all the guests are expected to remain for some weeks. (New York Journal.)

A Greenville, S. C., correspondent of the Journal of United Labor says of wages paid there: Field hands are paid 50 cents per day, and factory hands, who are principally children, are paid from 15 to 65 cents per day. Corn is 80 cents per bushel; flour, from \$6 to \$8 per barrel; bacon, 10 cents per pound.

There are said to be 1,000 women in the city of Pittsburgh who work in iron mills making bolts, nuts, hinges, and barbed wire. The leading social incident of the week, perhaps, was the parade of the four-hand coaches through Central park. Not so many drags were in line as in former years, which is a little strange, since, it is said, the club limit has recently been enlarged to take in more members. Possibly the fact that it is pretty difficult to find a reasonable excuse for making oneself conspicuous in this way has made it hard to persuade ladies to ride on the drags. Still, so long as the parade is mainly in the park little objection, if any, can be advanced on this score. The dinner at the Brunswick on the evening of the parade, predecessors, so far as preparations indicated anything. (New York Tribune.)

The Pennsylvania railroad company has sent out a corps of detectives on a crusade against the tramps who infest the line between Jersey City and Philadelphia. "We don't want to hear from you until the war is over," the railway officials said to the "undesirables," and the tramps are either in jail or on the Delaware. The detectives say that there are from one thousand to fifteen hundred tramps along the line. (New York Herald.)

A morning contemporary announces that owners of line equipages in New York complain bitterly that since Fifth avenue has been reserved it is so crowded with trucks and grocery wagons, from Fifth-ninth street to Washington square, that there is no pleasure or safety in driving on it.

A Chicago landlord has been arrested for brutally assaulting a widowed tenant who was unable to pay her rent. He is reported to have entered the house before mother or father had risen, seized the widow's property as security for back rent, and then hustled the family and furniture into the street, striking the women over the head with a chair when they attempted to feebly protest against such treatment.

FRANK HURD AND FREE TRADE.

TOLEDO, O., May 27.—Hon. Frank H. Hurd of this city delivered a lecture on the tariff question at Whalen's opera house, Friday, May 25. The house was crowded, in spite of a heavy rain. Every point the speaker made in favor of free trade was warmly applauded; in fact, the audience became enthusiastic. As Mr. Hurd proceeded I could see the door open wider and wider to the single tax that will surely take the place of the tariff now levied on industries. For the discussion go on, and let us help them to open the door. W.

MEN AND THINGS.

Dr. Rainsford, the rector of St. George's church in this city, has started a movement which may be the means of saving many lives during the coming summer. His congregation embraces many wretched dwellers in tenement houses, as well as a number of people lucky enough to have homes. The latter will be leaving the city for the summer, while the former will be compelled to stay in town. Dr. Rainsford proposes that the home owners should lend their houses to the tenement dwellers during the hot months. It is pleasing to hear that the idea has been favorably received. A committee of wealthy women have taken the matter in hand, and are selecting respectable and trustworthy poor people to act as caretakers of rich men's houses during the absence of their owners. Preference is being given, as is very proper, to widows with children.

It is actions such as this—and there is no lack of them—that give the lie to the oft-repeated assertion that the tendencies of human nature are in direct opposition to the precepts of Christ. The truth is that men and women are as a rule anxious to do just what Christ told them to do. They want to love their neighbors as themselves. They have a genuine anxiety to do to others as they would others should do to them. They would prefer to take no thought for the morrow, but to enjoy each day to the fullest, trusting that the inexhaustible bounty of the Father will provide for to-morrow as amply as it has done for yesterday and to-day. Who is there that is not anxious to relieve distress when he sees it? Who would not gladly avoid the petty falsehoods and cheatings of commerce, if he could afford to? How few are there who do not rebel against the necessity of hoarding—of stinting to-day lest there be nothing to eat to-morrow? The trouble is, not that men don't want to obey Christ's teachings, but that social conditions are such that they dare not obey them. Just as our wicked tariff laws compel Christians to stain their souls with false oaths, and excuse the sin with the plea of "mere formality," just so does the great social injustice that robs men of their heritage of God's bounty to the race compel them to deny themselves the joy of living as Christ bade them live, and as their own hearts urge them to live. Men cheat and lie, because skillful, undetected cheating and lying enable them to avoid poverty. They stifle their loving impulses, or do their helpful deeds shamefacedly and with apologies in the shape of committees and organizations, because to do otherwise would be to risk poverty for themselves and to encourage poverty in others. They deny themselves innocent amusement, and spend their lives in ignoble grubbing for wealth, because behind them stands the poverty phantom whose clutch they fear for themselves and those dear to them.

Al! if Dr. Rainsford would but really believe in the Christ he preaches! If he would but acknowledge that the Master knew, and uttered no fool platitudes when from the Judean mount he told men how he would have them live, and warned them, with terrible straightforwardness, that disobedience would be punished with damnation. If he would but realize that to talk of the impossibility of men doing precisely what Christ bade them do, or to acquiesce in laws and customs that forbid men to follow His precepts, is to blaspheme the Savior whom he thinks to serve. How quickly would he learn that what the poor he so loves and pities really need is not alms, but justice—not the humiliating permission to occupy rich men's homes for a season while the rich men are not using them, but righteous freedom to apply their labor to the earth that God created for the equal use of all men living, and make by honest toil happy homes for themselves.

"In my Father's house are many mansions." Does Dr. Rainsford think that in that land beyond the grave some spirits will be forced to humbly borrow mansions from happier souls? Yet if not, why not? For even in heaven itself it would be difficult for the Father to make more abundant provision for the housing of His children than He has done here on this earth of His love.

A German young woman, Miss Hedwig Heule, has had a pleasant little experience of American manners and customs. She was standing on one of the North river piers when a party, consisting of a woman and several men, accosted her, ordered her to accompany them into a building on the pier, and intimated that if she didn't go quietly they would drag her there. Seeing no way to help herself, Miss Heule obeyed. The woman followed her into the room, forced her to strip, and took from her a quantity of silk and other things which she had concealed beneath her clothing. It makes an American blush to write it, but the truth must be told. The ruffians who committed this outrage were in the employ of the United States government, and the stripping of Miss Heule, as well as the taking of her property, was regarded, not as a crime against a helpless woman, but as an act to be commended. Miss Heule had done her best to comply with the law as she understood it. She had perjured herself as the law required, and concealed her property to the best of her ability. But she didn't understand that she would be compelled to pass an examination *in puris naturalibus* as well as in the art of lying, and so she had to suffer for her ignorance.

The business men's association of Buffalo have offered a prize of \$100,000 for the discovery and sole right to use the best appliance to utilize the power of the Niagara river at or near Buffalo. It is not the cataract of Niagara that they propose to use, but the swift current of the river as it flows past the city, and this they expect to put in harness for the benefit of the whole community, so as to supply Buffalo with an amount of wheel turning power that will give her a front place among manufacturing cities.

In the attempt to bring such a scheme as this into practical operation the absurd justice of the system which permits private appropriation of natural opportunities becomes easily apparent. Sup-

pose the business men who belong to this association succeed in getting hold of an invention that will utilize this vast water-power now running to waste. The evident result will be that Buffalo rents will rise to such an extent that neither capital nor labor will derive any ultimate benefit. Nor will things be much better if the municipality of Buffalo should collect rent directly from all who make use of the power. For under our present system of taxation the effect will be felt chiefly in a reduction of the taxes on Buffalo lands; and to a landlord a reduction of taxes is equivalent to an increase of rent.

How different would it be if Buffalo simply took in taxes the full annual value of all lands within her limits. The harnessing of the Niagara river would then be a direct advantage to every one of her citizens. For it would mean an increase of the fund to be expended for the general benefit.

The church of the Holy Trinity here in New York evidently don't believe in rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. They imported the Rev. E. Walpole Warren, under a contract to preach for them, notwithstanding the express statutory prohibition of such actions. And now that their guilt has been duly proved in a court of law they announce that they intend to pay the fine of \$1,000 and retain the Rev. Warren to preach for them just the same. It seems clear that if they had imported a lot of bibles on the same steamer with their contract preacher they would have thought it no sin to attempt to evade the customs duty on the word of God. For evidently they think that the laws of the United States were made to be laughed at.

We shall watch the action of the United States district attorney in this matter with interest. The law distinctly provides not only that the importer of a contract laborer shall be fined \$1,000, but that the laborer himself shall be returned to his country. If the church of the Holy Trinity give Caesar his due by sending Mr. Warren back on the first steamer. After that, of course, they could re-import him without a contract and make up their minds to employ him after he got here. Any shrewd manufacturer might have advised them to do that in the first place.

The Pennsylvania railroad company has found it necessary to do something about the tramps who infest its line between Philadelphia and Jersey City. There are said to be between 1,000 and 1,500 of them, and the company is determined to drive them away. A corps of detectives has been given charge of the matter, with brief but comprehensive instructions. "We don't want to hear from you," the railway officials are reported to have said, "until all the tramps are either in jail or in Delaware." This is a little rough on Delaware.

The people of Iron Mountain City, in Michigan, will have to do without the circus this year. It isn't Mr. Barnum's fault. He was willing and anxious to take his greatest show on earth there and give the miners and their children a chance to see the elephant go around, and all the rest of it. But Mr. Barnum can't pitch his show tent unless he can find ground to pitch it on, and the fellows who own the bowels of the land thereabouts also own the surface, and won't allow it to be used for any such purpose as a circus exhibition. They can't afford to have their miners called away for a day, they tell Mr. Barnum; and, besides, they don't think circuses are moral agencies, anyhow.

There was a public meeting held in Minneapolis one evening lately which is worth telling about. It was a well-attended meeting—over 2,000 persons being present. It was a meeting of citizens of Minneapolis, male and female, assembled to let the world know what sort of a chance Minneapolis, with her unrivaled natural advantages and under the blessing of a high protective tariff, offers to the people who are willing to go to work and produce wealth by the sweat of their brows. Specimens of the products of Minneapolis were displayed upon the platform; and to each article was attached a placard showing the price paid for the labor of production. Here is a list of the articles exhibited, with the labor price of each:

A shirt	\$0.06
A pair of pants12
A pair of overalls05
A blouse04½
A blouse shirt03½

The assemblage, in short, was a mass meeting of Minneapolis working girls and their friends, and its object was to see if some way couldn't be devised by which the girls should get nine cents apiece for shirts, fourteen and a half cents for pants, and six cents each for overalls, blouses, and blouse shirts; those being the prices paid by the more open handed manufacturers of St. Paul. It must be confessed that the Minneapolis girls didn't ask much.

One of the speakers at this meeting was Mrs. C. O. Van Cleave, an elderly lady who for years has devoted such time as she could spare to philanthropic work among the poor of Minneapolis. She gave some curious pictures of Minneapolis society:

I have worked a great deal among girls who are known as outcasts and I have found they became such because they could not earn decent wages. It was ruin or starve. . . . I visited one woman that I found in a dead end over a sewing machine, and all I found in the house to eat was a little corn meal that she made into gruel for her sick husband and two little children. She was starving herself for them; she was making shirts for six cents apiece and of course could not earn enough to live on.

Let me tell you that girls who work out are frequently tempted to do wrong. They generally have to live in small, dingy rooms, and have but few comforts, with poor food, with ten hours of hard work every day. It becomes like a treadmill. I know of six girls that live in one room, living on bread, cheese and crackers, and hardly enough of that. Such a way of living cannot help but become demoralizing. They lose their self-respect; then come temptations, and they frequently yield and go down to ruin.

Another speaker was Mrs. E. S. Marble, who also related some of her personal experiences:

I know one case of a girl that came here from St. Cloud to earn her living because her folks were so poor; she promised her parents

to live an honest, upright life. Got sewing on overalls at sixty cents a dozen; she had to mortgage her furniture in her room; the mortgage was sold to another man, and he called on her and she told him she was only making a bare living. She had but little fire and no comforts. The party was convinced she was honest and went away. Down on the floor below was another girl who had a handsomely furnished room, and who hired all her sewing and washing done, who told this girl she was a fool for living as she was when she could have all the comforts of the city, but the girl would not yield. When the man who held the mortgage came again he found the girl had been sent to the hospital, sick from overwork and want, and from the hospital she was sent home to St. Cloud to die, because she chose to live an honest life—killed because she would be honest.

Another girl I tried to save told me that for years she tried to earn an honest living in this city, but had to yield.

It is awful to read stories like these. It is dreadful to think of them. But more terrible still is it to think that this is but an accidental lifting of a single corner of the veil, a momentary exposure of a mere decoration of the horrors that civilization decorously hides from view. Through what months and years of misery have these Minneapolis girls been dumbly making shirts at six cents each, fighting off sin with wan and toil worn hands, and martyring their bodies that their souls might live? How long will it be before the women of St. Paul will see their pitiful wage of nine cents a shirt cut down to the still more pitiful Minneapolis standard? What unimaginable horrors may not women be enduring in other cities—in Chicago? In St. Louis? In Cincinnati? In every place where fortunes are accumulated by the employment of female labor? And in every city, behind the wretched army making shirts at six and nine cents each, stand, hungry and despairing, the still more wretched ones who cannot get shirts to make at any price at all.

And how utterly needless it all is. How quickly would these congested masses of humanity disperse if only they were left free to do so. How many of these poor women might be happy wives and mothers were it not that the men who should have married them are forbidden by poverty to do so. How many of them are fitted for pleasant, gainful occupations, in which they are forbidden to engage unless some master can be found to employ them. Between them and happiness stands nothing but the fence of land monopoly, preventing them and the men who might have wooed and won them from applying their labor to the natural elements of production. Think of women starving, or compelled to sell their souls for bread, in Minnesota!

The New York coaching club held its tenth annual parade in Central park on May 25. The members wore a tasteful livery of bottle green coat with brass buttons, kerseymer waistcoats, light trousers and black hats. Colonel Jay's coach was red and yellow, with chestnut, gray and roan horses. Dr. Seward Webb had a yellow coach with chestnut horses; Mr. Prescott Lawrence a primrose and yellow coach, with brown and gray horses, and the other members drove coaches of various colors, with chestnut, gray, roan and other colored horses. The driving was very fairly done, the coaches and horses were successfully got back to their respective stables, and the members of the club went to dinner at the Hotel Brunswick, where a double horseshoe table was spread in the ball room, and the walls were adorned with whips, horse-shoes, and other emblems of the coachman's and farrier's crafts.

Wages of Lumbermen and the Tariff.
CLEARFIELD, Pa., May 24.—For the last few days I have been sojourning in the pine timber portion of Pennsylvania. The laboring men here find, like those of other parts of the state, are in favor of high tariff, being captivated with the word "protective." Coal is mined here to a considerable extent, but I confined my inquiries particularly to the manufacture of lumber—to learn what part of the product the wage worker received. The factories are located at Clearfield and Phillipsburgh, and this information was received from men that "feed the machine":

1 inch or 1½ inch doors:	
Cost of material (for 20 doors).....	\$10.00
Labor (1 man at \$2.25, helper at \$1).....	3.25
Value of finished product.....	25.00
1½ inch doors:	
Cost of material.....	20.00
Labor (1 man, 1 day, \$2.25; helper, \$1).....	3.25
Value of finished product.....	30.00
1-3-16 inch sash:	
Cost of material.....	10.00
Labor (3 men at \$1.75, 3 men at \$1.50).....	9.75
Value of finished product.....	50.00

Check roll sash:
Cost of material..... 15.00
Labor..... 11.37 1-2
Value of finished product..... 70.00
Thus on common doors and sash the laborer gets of the value added to the raw material an average of less than eighteen per cent. On higher grades of work, and that made of odd sizes to special order, the proportion that goes to the machine feeder is proportionately less. Would a high tariff help these men or free trade hurt them?

O. C. STEWART, M. D.

To Our Friends on the Route from Boston to Minneapolis.
The following, from the corresponding secretary of the Boston anti-poverty society, will explain itself. Professor Garland is a very effective speaker and has been doing good work in Boston and vicinity:

As a matter of interest to those wishing to arrange for lectures on either the tariff or the land questions, I would announce that Professor Hamlin Garland, vice-president of the anti-poverty society of Boston, and an experienced writer and lecturer, will start from Boston early in June with Minneapolis as the objective point. He proposes to make the journey in easy stages and to deliver lectures at all intermediate points where his services may be required. The only charge for these lectures will be the expense incident to a stop over or delay, and of traveling expenses where it is necessary to make a deviation from the direct route, which route will be by way of Albany, Syracuse, Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Chicago. All who wish to arrange dates for these lectures should write at once to Mr. Garland, whose address is Jamaica Plain, Boston, Mass.

EDWIN M. WHITE,
Cor. Sec. Boston Anti-poverty Society.

Harlem Single Tax Club.
The Harlem single tax club has a vigorous organization, and holds weekly meetings at 247 West 125th street, at 8:30 p. m.

FOREIGN NOTES.

What contradictions our civilization involves. Here, while England is shuddering at the possibility of armed invasion and trying to keep the laborers of continental Europe from coming to work in her factories and mines—while France is fencing herself off from the rest of the world with a perfect wall of a protective tariff—here are a number of French and English engineers maturing plans for building a bridge across the English channel and making intercourse between England and the rest of Europe easier than ever before.

And it is curious to observe how the world stands aghast at the idea of spending on a peaceful improvement of this kind a sum of money which would be thought moderate if it were to be spent on some scheme of wholesale slaughter. It is estimated that the proposed bridge will cost \$30,000,000, to be expended in six years. The English people will probably, without a growl, allow themselves to be taxed to about that extent to build new ships of war and equip them with improved monster guns. But it seems well impossible to them that France and England together can raise such a sum for the purpose of building a bridge which, by facilitating exchanges and intercourse between the two peoples, will do far more to avert a war than any mutual menacing of ships of war and guns could ever do.

The engineers assert that the Channel bridge presents no extraordinary difficulties in its construction. The depth of water nowhere exceeds thirty fathoms, and over much of the proposed route is not more than fifteen or twenty. The bridge is to be built in spans 1,600 feet long, resting on piers raised to sufficient height to avoid interference with navigation; and it will be equipped with four railway lines, carriage roads, and foot paths.

Whether the plan is feasible or not must be left to the engineering experts to decide; but if the proposed bridge can be built, it should be. And it ought to be erected, not by a private corporation, but by the English and French governments conjointly. To place such a great thoroughfare under private control simply to be bestowed on a few individuals the right to regulate and levy taxes on the commerce of two great nations.

They are beginning to talk seriously in England of nationalizing the canals; and it is significant of the progress of economic thought that the leading men in parliament, both in opposition and in the government, admit that there are strong arguments in favor of such a measure.

The pressure of population in the island of Lewis is being relieved by emigration. Lady Matheson, the "owner" of the island, has been one of the first to go. The crofter and cottar agitation was too much for her ladyship's nerves, and besides, she wasn't getting any rent. So she shook the dust of the ungrateful island from her feet and took the steamer from Stornoway. A considerable crowd assembled to see her off, but no demonstration was made of either joy or sorrow.

Next appeared the government commissioner to arrange for sending off other emigrants who, like Lady Matheson, were willing to leave the island, but, unlike her, had no money to pay their passages. Quite a number of crofters announced their willingness to go, but the commissioner would take only "middle aged, strong and healthy families," of whom he selected twenty-five, whose passages will be paid to Manitoba, where they will be settled on government land.

It really looks as though the English authorities had deliberately made up their minds that the only way to solve the social problem is to take all the bone and sinew and energy and enterprise in the country and bundle it neck and crop across the Atlantic.

The island of Rum, in the inner Hebrides, has been sold by one Scotch gentleman to another Scotch gentleman, who intends to use it purely and simply as a game preserve. Rum is not a large island. It measures only eight miles by seven, and contains a little over 30,000 acres. Neither is it a very fertile island, for it has several steep mountain peaks incapable of tillage. But even under the rude Hebridean system of cultivation more than two thousand acres of its surface were profitably worked twenty years ago, and the fisheries around it are sufficient to support several hundred families in comfort. In 1851 it had a population of 162. Since that time the people have been steadily crowded off to make room for deer, until now the only inhabitants are a few gamekeepers. This is humorously called the pressure of population upon subsistence.

London is going to have a new sensation—not quite equal to the Wild West show, but much in the same line. The Earl of Leitrim is going to erect and put on exhibition a complete Irish village, with thatched cottages, peat fires, boiled potato dinners, and other naturalistic features. The houses will be arranged "to form a picturesque village street," with a "holy well" in the center, and a real Irish cross above it. The cottages will be occupied by genuine Irish peasants, who will live in true Donegal fashion, pigs and all. The girls will card flax, spin it, and weave it into linen, and pursue other Irish industries. The landlord and the landlord's agent will form no part of the exhibition, which is intended to be one of idyllic peace and contentment.

It is worth something to an Englishman to be able to write esquire after his name, and to appear in the directory as "gentleman." A certain Mr. Toome—or, to speak by the card, a certain William Hastings Toome, Esq.—of Portman square, London, has been amusing himself with a little practical joke on the British public. He went down to Birmingham, took lodgings there, and advertised in some seventy papers for clerks at a salary of \$750 a year. When the answers commenced to pour in, which they did by the thousand, he sent every applicant a circular, stating that he was the sole agent for a large commercial un-

dertaking which was about to open offices in the principal cities of Great Britain, and requesting a remittance of five shillings to cover expenses of inquiries about character, etc. Several thousand unfortunate sent the five shilling remittance; and William Hastings Toome, Esq., was reaping a rich harvest, when one of the correspondents got suspicious, communicated with the Birmingham police and had the gentleman arrested. The case was duly tried and Toome was found guilty, his only defense being that the whole thing was a joke founded on a bet with another gentleman. The judge said that there was no evidence of fraud, and as the prisoner did not belong to the criminal classes, he should simply bind him over in two sureties of £50 each to be of good behavior. The sureties were at once forthcoming, and William Hastings Toome, Esq., was discharged. It seems a little funny that they should have gone to the expense of trying him.

Mrs. Frances Hodgson Burnett has succeeded where, hitherto, every one else has failed. She has managed, by an ingenious quibble, to get the English courts to protect her right to dramatize her own novels. It had to be done by a quibble, for the letter of the law is just the other way. If Smith copyrights a book in England, Brown has a right to found a play upon it, and Smith can't stop him.

Now a gentleman named Seebohm, seeing the dramatic possibilities of Mrs. Burnett's famous story "Little Lord Fauntleroy," worked it over into a play which he produced at a London theater, notwithstanding Mrs. Burnett's emphatic protest. Being requested to withdraw the play, and threatened with legal proceedings, Mr. Seebohm pointed to the law, and refused to point blank. Then Mrs. Burnett's lawyers brought an action against him for infringement of copyright, on the ground, not that he had made a play, but that in producing the necessary copies of his drama for the lord chamberlain and the actors, he had reproduced portions of Mrs. Burnett's copy. The court decided the point well taken, and issued an injunction "to restrain Mr. Seebohm from printing or otherwise multiplying copies of his play containing any passages copied, taken, or colorably altered from Mrs. Burnett's book." Mr. Seebohm has been directed "to state upon oath what copies of the work exist, and to extract from these copies in his power or possession and deliver up to the plaintiff for cancellation all passages copied, taken, or colorably imitated from the plaintiff's book," and to pay the costs.

New South Wales bids fair to enter the ranks of silver producing countries with a rush. Immense deposits have been discovered in the Broken Hills district, near the South Australian border, a single mine yielding already more than 70,000 ounces weekly. The Australian papers are crowded with the prospectuses of new silver mining companies, and men are flocking to the mines from every direction. If the silver deposits prove to be as ample as is now asserted, the question of the bimetallic standard will be settled in a very practical way.

COAL MINING, PROTECTION AND ROYALTIES.

Letter from a Western Coal Operator to a Protection Journal.

Charles G. Buck, vice-president of the Baker coal mining company of Colorado, which operates mines at Baker, Boulder county and has its main office at Denver, has sent this letter to the *Mining World*, a new coal paper published at Youngstown, Ohio. It is too good to be lost, so we present it to the readers of THE STANDARD:

DENVER, Col., May 17, 1888.

Editor *Mining World*: Received to-day the initial number of your beautifully printed journal. We should be pleased to subscribe for it as we feel it to our interest to keep abreast of the latest intelligence in coal mining circles, but for the fact that the policy of "protection" which appears to dominate your reading matter is repugnant to all fair minded persons in the coal business or its out. The Colorado operator does not, it is true, compete with foreign producers employing "paupers," but with Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois producers employing men at pauper wages. The wages paid here in Colorado under free trade (for the tariff can't do us good) are double those paid in the east where protective tariffs are said to be needed, and the only protection we require in the west is the raising of wages in the east. If our eastern mining interests which, according to a statement in the *World*, would be nowhere without governmental assistance and with our ports open to foreign coal, then the operator must be paying, in the east, too much for his coal. Royalties, as they are rightly called, or payments made by operators to landlords for the privilege of producing coal, are about one-fourth of the cost of the coal in the east. This arises from the fact that land containing coal is as yet much cheaper here than there. It is not the foreign coal, but the home landlord that the eastern operator should fear and ask protection from. Not from taxes levied on coal, but from taxes levied on land according to its value will come the real benefits which ignoramus now seek in vain from protective tariffs. Both wages and interest are low enough to allow any operator to control the home market and keep "free foreign coal" out. It is the cost of raw material, coal in the ground, not that of capital or labor, that now hampers and threatens our eastern mining interests. This cost can only be reduced by abolishing tariffs and other taxes on finished products and taxing land high enough to bring plenty of it into use. Coal in the ground will then be cheaper in price and easier to get at. Legitimate coal operators, not those who would limit the output of coal, but those who would increase it, demand freedom, not protection.

C. G. BUCK,
Vice-Pres. Baker Coal Mining Company.

The Late Abraham L. Earle—Resolutions of the Harlem Single Tax Club.

Whereas death has taken from our midst our honored member, Abraham L. Earle; and Whereas, We deeply feel the loss of his fellowship, sound counsel and sage advice; be it

Resolved, That this club extends its sympathy to his bereaved family in their affliction; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to his family and to THE STANDARD.

T. WELLS,
Cor. Sec. Harlem Single Tax Club,
No. 247 West 125th street.

THE INDIANS.

A Presbyterian Missionary Declares That All They Need is the Single Tax and No Whiskey.

The following letter was refused publication by several religious papers to which it was sent, because of what they styled its "Georgeism." We gladly give it place:

FORT PEAK AGENCY, Montana.—A life of fifteen years among the Indians has shown me some light on the Indian problem, which it seems to me important to bring before the citizens of the nation which is trying, vainly thus far, to solve it. I lived among the Ottawas in Michigan more than two years before and nearly five years after their reservations were opened to the white settlers. I have been more than eight years among the Sioux on reservations in Dakota and Montana. I have seen the working of both policies and become convinced that the following truths contain the key to the solution of the problem.

1. The Indians are men and cannot be saved without recognizing the rights of manhood. The longer they are treated as children the more childish they become. They are sinking deeper in pauperism. At this agency it costs the government as much to support them as it did when there were three times as many.

2. What they need is not special legislation in their behalf, but the protection of laws securing equal justice to all men. The government appropriates money to feed them, but does not teach them to earn their own living. The government undertakes to give their youth an education, both literary and industrial. A few learn to read and write English to a very limited extent. Some have acquired considerable skill in some kind of work. The government hires a few laborers, and the rest are left to eat the bread of idleness, as before. The favored laborers receive wages, and the rest get about rations enough to save them from being starved to death. The government sets apart reservations to protect them from the intrusion of white people and keep out settlers who would give them employment. The Indians are induced to scatter with a view to farming, and the only result is that their time and strength are consumed in coming to the agency for their rations. Children are educated by forcibly kidnapping them, in utter disregard of parental rights, the authorities thus repeatedly committing the crime which aroused the indignation of all Europe a few years ago, when it was committed in Italy against one Jewish child. Many become sick, and some die in the school, away from home and kindred. Those who live to graduate become "camp Indians" again, no better for the "education" they have received at the expense of the government.

Our present policy is unjust in pauperizing the Indians and then making their pauperism an excuse for invading family rights on the plea that their children must be taught to support themselves. And the Indians' hearts are broken and our money is spent in vain. To educate Indians under present conditions is to enable a few of them to support themselves and to leave the rest to fall back into pauperism.

I refer to the government plan of wholesale education. There are mission schools where a limited number of Indian youth can obtain a better education than in government schools. The supply of those who obtain this higher education is not equal to the demand. But graduation at a government school gives no assurance of self-support.

What then can be done for the Indians?

1. They, like other races, need the reform for which the single tax men are working. "Have the workers of iniquity no knowledge," says God in Psalm 53, "who eat up people as they eat bread." As long as we continue our present unjust policy, we are "workers of iniquity," we "eat up" God's red children. We cannot plead the lack of knowledge for God has given to this generation light on political economy, which shows how we can stop it. To redeem the Indians from pauperism the first thing is to relieve the glut in the labor market by abolishing taxes on industry. Then the poor white man, the Chinaman, the negro and the Indian can all find something to do, and can all get for their labor whatever it is worth.

2. The next thing which the Indians need is the reform which the prohibition party proposes. The only way in which the reservation system benefits the Indians is by enabling the agent to keep liquor away from them. If the traffic was suppressed among white people, their settlement among the Indians would not be an injury, but a benefit.

3. A homestead should be given to every Indian, and the rest of the reservations should be open to other settlers. As far as I know their feelings, the Indians would be glad of the change. There would be district schools, and their children would not be arrested like criminals and put into boarding schools by force. They would be cultivating a little land for themselves, and partly by working for their white neighbors, they could support themselves and dispense with government rations.

4. All distinctions of race should be abolished, and the laws administered impartially. A crime against an Indian should meet with the same punishment as when the victim is a white person.

How will these principles solve the Indian problem? Apply them, and the Indians will solve it themselves. They are made of human nature as well as we, and what they want is a fair chance, equal laws, and equality.

W. WOOD,
Presbyterian Missionary.

A Word to the "Press."

STANTON, Goodhue Co., Minn.—We have of late been receiving in this neighborhood copies of the weekly edition of the New York *Press* for which some kind friend has subscribed for six months. Not being acquainted with the *Press* or the friend, I wish to thank them through THE STANDARD. I like the *Press*. It talks right out for the poor, oppressed laboring man. It doesn't say much about our old soldiers, but of course it will protect us along with other bond holders, for it wants the tariff kept up so that the government can pay interest on the bonds and pensions to the soldiers. Of course the pensions are all—over half of them are less than fifty dollars a month—but even if soldiers got fifty per cent of this pension in the shape of duties and taxes they ought to get along. I like the *Press*'s treatment of our Irish Americans, too. A few years ago, with the republican papers, it was Paddy that drank all the whiskey and voted the democratic ticket, but now it is: Brave Irish patriots, arise and protect your new country from the Cobden club and British free trade; join the republican high tariff army!

I would just like to ask the *Press*: If the English own 23,000,000 acres of our land, have millions invested in our mortgages, railroads, mines, etc., and the ships that come here, how is it that they want to ruin us with free trade? Ah, no! The *Press* has too much to say about the beautiful Jordan of the republican party, but it never tells us that the Jordan empties into the Dead Sea.

JAMES POLLARD.

Senator Chace has referred to the fact that Mr. Breckinridge and Mr. Mills have denounced protection as robbery when they were at home, but said nothing of the kind

You have a great aversion, as you think, to English ideas, as well as to English goods. Yet your high tariff really owes its main support to Englishmen, both in votes and in arguments. If the British border voters of this country were even equally divided, you could not maintain protection through an congress. Your best support is furnished by Robert P. Porter, an Englishman by birth and education; and your only professor of political economy worth mentioning is Professor Robert Ellis Thompson, who was born in Ulster, and therefore represents the Scotch-Irish element. All the arguments which you present on behalf of protection are borrowed from old and obsolete English newspapers. You have not an original idea among you. You have not a single new idea, except the idea of taxing the few old cast clouts and old rotten rags of precedent, disease-infected and fever-stricken, long ago cast off by England as beneath contempt, thrown by her into her dust bin, and carefully hooked out by Americans, to be imported here. What a blessing would have been a prohibitory tariff on English idleness! You have never shown any capacity for any kind of practical statesmanship to frame any method of taxation, excepting on the basis of old and long discarded English statutes. When old Thad Stevens undertook to frame an internal revenue bill, he scorned to take notice of the perfected measure which Gladstone had framed, as the result of England's century of experience, but instead of that, took as his exact model the old and long repealed statute of William Pitt, which had been an utter failure in England, and had been an utter failure in England, and used the method of taxation, and fastened that upon us, to the enormous detriment of

No one considers the internal system of taxation a thing of beauty or a joy forever. To the average democrat all forms of taxation are obnoxious. Democrats do not believe taxation to be helpful, but hurtful and oppressive. They do not defend the system of internal taxation as a means of grace nor as a marvelous invention which is multiplying the wealth of the country. They do not endorse it with any of the virtues ascribed by Mr. Randall to the tariff.

Organized speculation in stocks makes possible the flow of capital for investment into needed enterprises, as would not otherwise be possible, and organized speculation in commodities cheapens the cost of transferring them

opolists naturally oppose a bill which, after all, would only slightly lessen their monstrous profits. But a business which allows its few owners to pocket a million and a half a year piece while they are cutting down the wages of their workmen is not a legitimate industry.

who use it, and measures are being taken to see if there is any relief to be had. In Allegheny, Pa., numerous meetings have been held on the subject, and it is proposed to take the matter into the courts, which looks like a case of locking the stable after the stealing of the horse.

a protective
lands are kep
far as home
with the lumbe
world, while on
on with every
chooses to bid

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Exports and Imports.

OBERLIN, O.—It is asserted by protectionists that if our imports exceed our exports we must ship money to pay for the excess. In the published bulletins of imports and exports it is not the fact that all money payments are included? E. H.

I do not so understand it. Nor is it true, as protectionists assert, that money must be exported to pay for an excess of imports. The precious metals are used for that purpose in part, but it should never be forgotten that the precious metals are themselves a product. But shipment of these metals is not the only mode of balancing an excess of imports, nor does an excess of exports mean, necessarily, that we are selling more than we are buying. When a foreigner takes title to our land, or invests in our bonds, mortgages or corporations, he contributes to the settlement of an exchange balance against us; and when we send drafts abroad to pay interest on public debts, or when servant girls or laborers send drafts home to help the old people, or when drafts are sent over to help the Irish cause or to relieve a famine, or when tourists take drafts to pay their expenses, these drafts contribute to the settlement of an exchange balance in our favor. In the former case our excess of imports and in the latter our excess of exports is to that extent balanced without any transhipment of gold. The transactions are cleared or set off through the medium of banks.

The Speculator.

St. Augustine, Fla.—There is a real estate speculator here who owns a valuable vacant tract of land in the very heart of the city, for which he asks, say, \$10,000. In argument he claimed that under the land tax system he could hold said land, pay the taxes on it, and at the end of several years could sell it for enough to refund his taxes and make a big profit, as some one would want it badly enough to buy at his own price. Also, he claimed he could buy vacant land in the suburbs and do the same thing, as this is a resort and not a manufacturing place. In other words, that the George theory would not prevent land speculation. An answer will give light to several here who are seeking it. B.

It what this speculator says were true, it would only prove that a more drastic remedy than the single tax for the wrong of private ownership is necessary. But it is not true.

If all taxes but the land value tax were abolished, and the tax that fell upon the particular land you mention were less than its annual value, there would be a margin for speculation; but that margin would be less than it is now, and if the tax rate were raised to the full value for public improvement it would be extinguished.

Your speculator's land is worth, you say, \$10,000. Let us suppose that the single tax should be three per cent. Then he would have to pay \$300 a year for the privilege of keeping that land out of use. If he did that for ten years, how much would it be necessary for him to hold the land at to get his money back in addition to the present value? At the end of ten years his account would be like this:

Present value,	\$10,000
Interest on present value, ten years at five per cent.,	5,000
Taxes, ten years at three per cent.,	3,000
Interest on taxes, say	825
	\$18,825

Unless, then, he could get in round numbers \$19,000 for the land at the end of ten years the speculation would not be particularly profitable; and if he got less than \$12,000 it would be a dead loss. This he will acknowledge.

He will say, however, that at the end of ten years the land will be worth a great deal more than now. Very likely. But he could not, under the single tax, count on that for profit for two reasons: First, the increase in value will not be a sudden jump at the expiration of ten years, but a more or less gradual advance during that period, which advance would be attended with a corresponding increase of taxation; and, second, selling values will rather decline than advance when land is burdened with a full value tax.

If land that will yield an annual rent of \$10 will sell for \$100 under the existing system of taxation, it will sell for more if the rate of land value tax is reduced, and for less if the rate is increased. And if the increase be so great as to take the entire rent it will not sell for anything.

Protection for Land.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.—In the issue of May 10, under "Queries and Answers," you say: "It (free trade) would reduce the value of mines, forests and some other lands adapted to special purposes, and increase the demand for labor employed in mining, lumbering," etc. Will you not in your next enlarge upon this and explain this statement as I do not think this truth is readily grasped, whereas the article, as a whole, is a very useful one to the free trade missionary. I. H. SANDERS.

Protective tariffs tend to increase the value of those lands in the protected jurisdiction from which protected commodities are taken. The reason is that such lands are withdrawn from competition with lands of the same kind elsewhere. This tendency is more or less marked according to the supply in the protected jurisdiction of lands yielding protected products. Thus a protective tax on agricultural products might not noticeably increase the value of our agricultural land, even if we were not already exporters, because we have such a vast acreage of such land; but a protective tariff on copper increases the value of copper mines to a marked degree, because it compels all American consumers of copper to get the product from American mines, which are few. And what is true of copper is true in greater or less degree of coal, iron, lumber, etc. To abolish the tariff on these commodities would reduce the value of copper, coal, iron and lumber lands, which would permit to their more extensive use and thus increase the demand for labor.

Take lumber land for illustration. With a protective tariff on lumber our lumber lands are kept out of competition, so far as home consumption is concerned, with the lumber lands of all the rest of the world, while our lumberers are in competition with every laborer of the world who chooses to bid against them. It is obvious

that this must enhance the value of lumber land and diminish the wages of lumberers. But if the tariff on lumber be abolished our lumber lands must compete with lumber lands everywhere without other restriction than the cost of transporting the product, and it is equally obvious that this would reduce the value of our lumber lands, and by thus making it possible for men of less capital to use such lands would enhance the demand for labor, which, as labor could not be any more readily supplied than now, would increase wages.

The Liquor Traffic.

PRINCETON, Ill.—I have been reading THE STANDARD since the first of January. With some things in it I agree; but why is it, may I ask, that in all you have to say you ignore entirely the main living issue, and the one evil of all others that overshadows this nation and is the blight and curse that rests upon us as a nightmare—the liquor traffic?

A. W. BROKAW.

It is not the liquor traffic but the liquor appetite that is the curse you mean. Let the appetite die away and the traffic will disappear; but while the appetite remains the traffic cannot be stopped. You prohibitionists are riding your hobby blind before. Here is a traffic caused by an appetite which is chiefly due to unnatural social conditions that make life a tissue wearing, nerve exciting, brain destroying struggle; and instead of trying to give social conditions a chance to be natural, and thus by removing the appetite for liquor putting an end to the liquor traffic, you start out to prohibit the traffic. You might as well try to abolish Canada thistles by cutting off the tops. If the liquor traffic is ever abolished it will be through free trade instead of prohibition.

THE STANDARD does not ignore the temperance question. It simply does not approve the back-sword method of eradicating intemperance which the prohibitionists propose.

Notes.

AUGUST PERRY, New York.—The statement of fact on which your reasoning is based, namely, "It is beyond contradiction that the laborer in the United States receives a larger proportion of the product than does the European laborer," is not true. Without going into detail, let me quote this extract from Mr. Shearman's article in the June number of Belford's Magazine: "The value of production per hand in all the combined metal and textile industries in 1880 was, in America, \$1,684, and in England only \$780. Thus the value of each American workman to his employer was 116 per cent greater than the value of each Englishman."

LOUIS F. POST.

THE LABOR QUESTION.

It is only to be solved by Freedom.

Justus Grenell in Detroit Advance. Give the laborer an opportunity to get a living, and no matter how hard the work may be or how many the hours, so long as he receives the full fruits of his toil, he will not "strike." He gets all he earns, and he is satisfied. To-day he has not this opportunity, even in free America, even in free Michigan. Let a man be never so anxious to go to work for himself; let him be never so intelligent, never so strong, never so determined to "get on," he must first ask permission of somebody else and accept of his terms before he will be allowed to work for himself. Is not this so? And is it not natural that those who have the power to make the terms should make them as much for their own benefit as they can? The conditions imposed in this country are much milder than in some others, and in this much is the laborer better off in America than in Europe. Those who impose the conditions here are not such a close corporation as there. Our natural resources are too vast to be absorbed in so short a time. But we are coming to it rapidly, and it is only a question of a few years when the condition of the wage worker here and in the old world will be on a level.

When any one who wishes to, has the opportunity to go to work, the necessity which now exists for poor houses and poor commissions will have ceased. For then it will be possible to enforce, without doing anyone a wrong, the command of St. Paul, "He that will not work, neither shall he eat," at least at the public expense.

Equally as important as the opportunity to produce is the liberty to exchange. Given freedom in one direction and restriction in the other, and the producer is robbed of some of the fruits of his toil, the same as when he is compelled to pay a tax for the liberty to produce. That man will be best protected in his rights who is given the greatest liberty, and that nation will be the happiest and most prosperous which is left to exchange its products where it can get the largest return. Close interweaving with the liberty to produce and the freedom to exchange is the question of taxation. If one be allowed full liberty in both directions, of what will it avail him if his sustenance is taken from him by the police in the form of robbery and taxation? It is safe to say that two-thirds of all the eight hundred million dollars of taxes paid in this country are worse than thrown away.

Were the wealth that is thus diverted destroyed it would be lost, but even as it is now to sustain a horde of useless officials, it is not only a loss but a detriment. It keeps people doing useless things, when they should be at some useful work; it keeps others keeping track of the first lot, and it unsettles nearly all of us who are brought in contact with its red tapeism, its class privileges, and its comparatively easy way of gaining a livelihood. It changes workers into drones; it enables the class to live off the sweat of other men's brows.

Whatever restrictions are made for the benefit of one class are to the detriment of all the other classes. Whatever business is by a tax on all other business made prosperous, is at the expense of all other business. Artificial barriers to trade are as detrimental to the welfare of the laborers as are natural barriers, yet we are continually erecting the one kind, while at the same time, with our railroads and steamboats, we are trying to overcome the other. Who dare say, except he be a fool or knave, that the liberty to exchange is not of as great importance as the liberty to produce? Who dare say that robbery in one direction is not as great an iniquity as in the other?

The solution of the labor question, then, depends on such a rearrangement of conditions as shall give the humblest person an opportunity to use to the best advantage his abilities on those things that belong as much to him as those who are better endowed, either mentally or physically; in the repeal of all laws that restrict freedom of trade; and in the abolition of those numerous bureaus, commissions, offices and courts that do much more harm than the evils they are created to prevent. When these reforms are consummated the labor question will have been solved.

How to Get Rid of Horses.

Marshal, an English writer of the last century, had an idea that horses were useless animals which ought to be discouraged. Accordingly he proposed respecting orses what our beneficent governments, state and national, are actually doing respecting all kinds of useful property, horses included: "In these days of famine and taxation," he said, "what political blindness must that be which suffers the produce of the country to

be consumed by animals that make no return to the magazine of human food, nor make any adequate recompense to the community for the expense they are hourly creating—animals that are preying on the sustenance which is wanted to suppress the cravings of the species, animals for whose support the country may be said to be now paying sums incalculable. And surely they ought to be made accountable for an adequate part of the debt they are lavishly incurring. A tax of one guinea a year (on every horse, whether used in husbandry or otherwise), for the first three years, with an additional tax of one guinea a year every third year, so long as sound policy shall see right (thus allowing time for the rearing of cattle), will raise an immense revenue, will lessen essentially the consumption of grain, and throw into the markets an abundant increase of animal food."

The Cause of Poverty in the Azores.

In a paper on the Azores as a "health resort," by Dr. I. M. Junkin, in the Medical and Surgical Reporter, appears the following:

The remains of the old feudal system still exist, though it is nearly worn out; but the land, especially on San Miguel, is held by a comparatively few proprietors. The evil effects of this system, in the poverty of a large portion of the people; many of them, even old men and women, go entirely barefooted, and are thinly clothed; they must be rather uncomfortable in the cooler days of the summer months, for sometimes the thermometer gets as low as 50 degrees.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

BOUND VOLUMES

OF

THE STANDARD.

A limited number of bound volumes of THE STANDARD, in heavy boards, are offered for sale at the following prices:

Volumes 1 and 2, bound in a single volume, \$5.00.
(Postage 75 cents extra.)

Volume 2, bound separately, \$3.50.
(Postage 50 cents extra.)

Address THE STANDARD,
12 Union square, east, New York.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

BELFORD'S MAGAZINE.

Messrs. Belford, Clarke & Co. beg to announce that in May they will issue the first number of a new monthly magazine, devoted to politics, fiction, poetry, general literature, science and art.

In politics the new magazine will give an independent support to the democratic party and to the present administration. It will advocate the extinguishment of the surplus, not by squandering it in extravagant expenditures, which are usually merely a thinly disguised form of widespread corruption, but by a reduction in taxation. It will advocate the consummation of this reduction by a reform of the present iniquitous and burdensome tariff in the direction of free trade or of a tariff for revenue purposes only; such reform to be effected in the interests of the farmers, the workmen, and the great mass of the population, as opposed to the manipulators of rings and trusts, and other monopolists who the present tariff enables to accumulate vast fortunes at the expense of the general community. These and other political and social questions of general interest will be treated in a popular manner, suitable to the pages of a magazine which is intended to reach all classes of the people.

The department of fiction will be exceptionally full. Instead of a serial story, dragging its slow length through several months, and exhausting the patience of the reader, a complete novel will be published in each number, and each issue will also contain one or more short stories complete.

In these departments of politics and fiction, and also in those of general literature, science, and art, the very best talent of the country will be enlisted. As the publishers are convinced that the illustration of magazines has been greatly overdone in this country, they have decided to dispense with illustrations altogether. They intend that their magazine shall be read, not that its pages shall be merely turned over for the purpose of looking at pictures.

As editors and publishers are glad to be able to announce that they have secured the services of Col. Donn Platt, a gentleman of long and varied literary experience, both as a journalist and as a literary man, and also a patriot well known throughout the land by reason of his connection with the history and politics of the country during the past twenty-five years.

He will be assisted by a staff of sub-editors, and also by a large number of able contributors, among whom will be:

DAVID A. WELLS,
HON. FRANK HIND,
PROF. W. G. SUMNER,
J. S. MOORE (Parson Merchant),
HON. JOHN B. CARLISLE,
HENRY WATSON,
HENRY GEORGE,
JULIAN HAWTHORNE,
EDGAR SALTUS,
JOHN JAMES PIATT,
THOS. G. SHEARMAN,
GEN. H. V. BOYNTON,
SARAH E. R. PIATT,
EDGAR FAWCETT,
JOEL BENTON,
ELLA WHEELER WILCOX,
REV. GEORGE LORIMER,
E. HERON-ALLEN,
COATES-KINNEY,
JAMES WHITE (with the liberty of the press),
SOLIE SMITH (Falcon),
GERTRUDE GARRISON.

BELFORD'S MONTHLY will be a first-class medium for advertising, as the publishers guarantee a bona fide circulation during the first six months of at least 70,000 copies per month.

Price, \$2.50 a year; or 25 cents per number.
N. B.—All business communications should be addressed to the publishers, 30 and 32 Broadway, New York city. Contributions and editorial correspondence should be sent to the editor at the same address.

BELFORD, CLARKE & CO.,

Publishers,

New York, Chicago and San Francisco.

THE SINGLE TAX.

Special editions of ready-printed newspapers containing matter of general interest, at low prices, UNION PRINTING CO., 15 Vandewater street, New York.

COOGAN BROS.

125 COOGAN BROS' 121

COOGAN BROS.,

CARPET AND FURNITURE DEALERS,

COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

HOLLAND'S

COFFEE AND DINING ROOMS,

115 Fourth Avenue,

bet. 15th and 16th sts.

HENRY GEORGE'S WORKS.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY,
An Inquiry Into the Cause of Industrial
Depression and of Increase of Want With
Increase of Wealth—The Remedy.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

256 pages.

CONTENTS:

Introductory.—THE PROBLEM.
Book I.—WAGES AND CAPITAL.
Chap. 1. The current doctrine of the insufficiency of wages.
2. The meaning of the terms.
3. Wages not drawn from capital, but produced by the labor.
4. The maintenance of laborers not drawn from capital.
5. The real functions of capital.
Book II.—POPULATION AND SUBSISTENCE.
Chap. 1. The Malthusian theory—its genesis and support.

2. Inferences from fact.
3. Inferences from analogy.
4. Disproof of the Malthusian theory.
Book III.—THE LAWS OF DISTRIBUTION.
Chap. 1. The inquiry narrowed to the laws of distribution—necessary relation of these laws.

2. Rent and the law of rent.
3. Interest and the cause of interest.
4. Of surplus capital and of profits often mistaken for interest.
5. The law of interest.
6. Wages and the law of wages.
7. Correlation and coordination of these laws.
8. The statistics of the problem thus explained.

Book IV.—EFFECT OF MATERIAL PROGRESS UPON

THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.
Chap. 1. The dynamics of the problem yet to seek.
2. Effect of increase of population upon the distribution of wealth.
3. Effect of improvements in the arts upon the distribution of wealth.
4. Effect of the expectation raised by material progress.

Book V.—THE PROBLEM SOLVED.

Chap. 1. The primary cause of recurring paroxysms of industrial depression.
2. The persistence of poverty amid advancing wealth.

Book VI.—THE REMEDY.

Chap. 1. Insufficiency of remedies currently advocated.
2. The true remedy.

Book VII.—JUSTICE OF THE REMEDY.
Chap. 1. Injustice of private property in land.
2. Enslavement of laborers the ultimate result of private property in land.
3. Claim of land owners to compensation.
4. Property in land historically considered.
5. Property in land in the United States.

Book VIII.—APPLICATION OF THE REMEDY.

Chap. 1. Private property in land inconsistent with the best use of land.
2. How equal rights to the land may be asserted and secured.
3. The proposition tried by the canons of taxation.

4. Indemnities and objections.
Book IX.—EFFECTS OF THE REMEDY.
Chap. 1. Of the effect upon the production of wealth.
2. Of the effect upon distribution and thence upon production.

3. Of the effect upon individuals and classes.
4. Of the changes that would be wrought in social organization and social life.

Book X.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS.

Chap. 1. The current theory of human progress—its limitations.
2. Differences in civilization—to what due.
3. The law of human progress.
4. How modern civilization may decline.
5. The central truth.

Conclusion.—THE PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUAL LIFE.

The new Land and labor library paper edition of "Progress and Poverty" is now ready, price thirty-five cents. This is printed on better paper, in larger type, is better bound and a considerably larger book than the previous twenty-cent edition.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

244 pages.

CONTENTS:

1. The increasing importance of social questions.
2. Political disorders.
3. Coming increase of social pressure.
4. Two opposing tendencies.
5. The march of concentration.
6. The wrong in existing social conditions.
7. Is it the last of all possible worlds?
8. That we all might be rich.
9. First principles.
10. The rights of man.
11. Dumping garbage.
12. Over-production and wages.
13. Unemployed labor.
14. The effects of machinery.
15. Slavery and slavery.
16. Public debts and indirect taxation.
17. The functions of government.
18. What we must do.
19. The great reform.
20. The American farmer.
21. City and country.
22. Conclusion.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

An Examination of the Tariff Question with
Special Regard to the Interests of Labor.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

CONTENTS:

I. Introductory.
II. Clearing ground.
III. The tariff.
IV. Protection as a universal need.
V. The protective union.
VI. Trade.
VII. Production and producers.
VIII. Tariffs for revenue.
IX. Tariffs for protection.
X. The encouragement of industry.
XI. The home market and home trade.
XII. Exports and imports.
XIII. Confusions arising from the use of money.
XIV. Do high wages necessitate protection?
XV. Of advantages and disadvantages as reasons for protection.
XVI. The development of manufactures.
XVII. Protection and producers.
XVIII. Effect of protection on American industry.
XIX. Protection and wages.
XX. The abolition of protection.
XXI. Inadequacy of the free trade argument.
XXII. The Real Weakness of Free Trade.
XXIII. The Real Strength of Protection.
XXIV. The Paradox.
XXV. The Robber that Takes All that is Left.
XXVI. Free Trade and the farmer.
XXVII. The Lion in the Way.
XXVIII. Free Trade and Socialism.
XXIX. Practical Politics.
XXX. Conclusion.

THE LAND QUESTION.

What It Involves, and How Alone It Can
Be Settled.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

87 pages.

PROPERTY IN LAND.

A Passant-At-Arms Between the Duke of
Argyll and Henry George.

77 pages.

FORTSCHRITT AND ARMUTH.

(Progress and Poverty in German.)
TRANSLATION OF C. D. F. GUTSCHOW.

430 pages.

PRICE LIST.

Progress and Poverty, paper.....	\$.50
" " cloth.....	1.00
" " half calf or half morocco.....	2.50
Social Problems, paper.....	.50
" " cloth.....	1.00
" " half calf or half morocco.....	2.50
Protection or Free Trade? paper.....	.50
" " cloth.....	.50
" " half calf or half morocco.....	3.00
Property in Land, paper.....	.15
The Land Question, paper.....	.10
Progress and Poverty, German, paper.....	.50

For sale by all booksellers, or sent postpaid on receipt of price. Foreign orders of these books imported on order.

HENRY GEORGE, 12 Union square, New York.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

BELFORD, CLARKE & CO.'S

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Novel with a Plot.

THE TRUTH ABOUT TRISTEM VARICK.

By Edgar Saltus, author of "Mr. Inco's Misadventure," etc.

12mo, cloth, \$1. Paper covers, 50 cents.
In this novel Mr. Saltus has treated a subject hitherto unexploited in fiction. The scene is Fifth Avenue, the action emotional, the plot a surprise. "There is," some one has said, "as much mud in the upper classes as in the lower; only in the former it is gilded." This aphorism might serve as epigraph to "Tristem Varick."

Thirteenth thousand ready April 1.

THE TARIFF ON IMPORTS INTO THE
UNITED STATES AND THE FREE LIST.

As contained in act of March 3, 1883, also the Hawaiian Reciprocity Treaty, and extracts from the Navigation and Commerce acts.

Indexed. 12mo, paper covers, 25 cents.

ASHES OF THE FUTURE.

By Edward Heron-Allen.

Beautifully printed in the best French style, with an illustrated cover, 50 cents.

"The story is of absorbing interest."—Chicago Journal.

"The work of a very vigorous and cultivated pen, as well as of a deep thinking and fervid brain. It is the story of a restless lover of too many things, and of too many good women whose hearts he breaks and whose lives he shatters."—Brooklyn Eagle.

"MES AMOURS."

Confessions: Passionate and Playful.

Written to me by people, celebrated and obscure, and my answers to some of them. With an introduction and notes. Illustrated, small 4to, with portrait, \$1.25. Selina Dolan, author of the play, "In the Fashion."

"It is seldom that the English reader happens upon a book of verses so full of French humor and this pretty volume, 'Ma Belle Amie,' the opening selection is edited with a running fire of comments that renders it delightful. The 'afterthoughts' appended to all the verses are often very clever and womanish."—New York Herald.

PRINCE COASTWIND'S VICTORY;

OR,
The Fairy Ride of Cronin Lake.

By Mrs. Miles H. McNamara.

With illustrations. Small 4to, cloth, illustrated cover, \$1.00.

"A pretty fairy story, which will delight while it takes the credulity of young readers. The book is tastefully printed and in handsome covers, and is closed in a box ready for mailing."—Chicago Inter Ocean.

THE ROMANCE OF A QUIET WATERING
PLACE.

12mo, cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
Thirty French illustrations by Graves.

By a New York Society Lady.

A SLAVE OF CIRCUMSTANCES.

By E. DeLancey Pierson.

12mo, cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.

A Novel of Incident, Plot and Action. Scene, Fifth Avenue, New York.

IN PRESS:

A DREAM AND A FORGETTING.

By Julian Hawthorne.

12mo, cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.

Mr. Hawthorne's latest and most interesting novel.

HIS WAY AND HER WILL.

Author unknown.

12mo, cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.

A great New York Society Novel.

SOPHIA-ADELAIDE.

Illustrated with Portraits of the Princess.

Paper covers, 50 cents.

CURRENT THOUGHT.

If he outlives his mamma, and the British social system holds together, the prince of Wales will some day become the Defender of the Faith and the head of a great Christian organization. It is therefore pleasing to learn that even in his present caterpillar condition of his apparent he has done something for the cause of God. And it is doubly pleasing to Americans to know that his daughter-in-law, even his only-blow on behalf of pure religion and unadorned truth right here in the city of New York. The fact will reconcile many to Christianity and increase, if possible, their respect for the good prince. Mr. H. E. Krebs tells the story in the June number of *Harper's Magazine*.

For a generation or more before the civil war members of Trinity church congregation had been trying, without success, to have portions of the service sung by surpliced chorists of boys, after the fashion in English cathedrals. Mr. Cutler, the organist, was peculiarly active in the matter and succeeded so far as to drive all the women out of the choir and substitute boys in their places. But there he stuck. The congregation wouldn't stand the surplices, as *savoring* too much of Romanism. Somebody presented a full set of choir vestments, but Mr. Cutler was forbidden to use them, and they were consequently put away among the other treasures of the church.

This was the aspect of the case when Mr. Cutler found an unexpected but very powerful ally in the heir apparent to the throne of Great Britain. In the fall of 1860 New York prepared to receive a visit from the prince of Wales. He was to be in the city from the 11th to the 15th of October, and the 14th being Sunday, he accepted an invitation to attend divine service at Trinity church. Mr. Cutler's opportunity had arrived. Without delay he and his associates in the cause laid before the church authorities a request for permission to use the idle vestments. Their argument was as simple as it was effective. They represented that the spectacle of a lot of boys in roundabouts and neck gear of assorted styles and colors sitting in the chancel would be disturbing to the prince's sense of propriety. Fortwith Mr. Cutler was instructed to put the boys in the new fangled frocks for the edification of the prince, and lest the weavers should mar the solemnity of the occasion by awkward movements in them, they were directed to wear three Sundays before the prince's visit for rehearsal. . . . It had taken a long time to get the choir into vestments, but once in, it was not taken out. Surpliced choirs had come to stay in Trinity parish.

There isn't that a delightful story! Doesn't it illustrate beautifully the intense Americanism, the deep religious feeling, the anxiety to know the right and to do it, of the Trinity people. The church, you see, was the house of God—specially set apart for and consecrated to his service. Everything done in it was to be *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. The congregation kicked against a surpliced choir as savoring of Romanism, and consequently disrespectful to the Most High. But the prince of Wales came along, with his fine sense of religious propriety, and the rulers of the congregation saw a new light. In their revised version of the scriptures they found the text, "What the prince of Wales hath cleansed, that call not thou common. So they put the choir boys into surplices; and to make sure that they should wear them gracefully before the future king of England they made them first rehearse for two or three Sundays before God Almighty.

Mr. Joel Burton makes a savage attack on something which he appears to think is the theory of the single tax on land values, (1) and apparently demolishes it to his own satisfaction. What sort of a man of straw he is doing battle with may be judged from his opening sentence:

Readers of Henry George's empiric philosophy have been told—and his acolytes peddle out the platitudes with much phrasing and infinite iteration—that society is greatly wronged by something which he calls an "unearned increment."

Who has been making this extraordinary statement to the "readers," or to whom the acolytes have been peddling this platitude. Mr. Benton does not say. But he clearly believes that the statement has been made and the platitude peddled. For the whole of his little essay is devoted to an attempt to prove—not that the unearned increment does not belong to the community—but that there isn't any unearned increment, anyhow. And this is the sapient conclusion at which he arrives:

Seeing, as all may, how little land does for its owner everywhere, and for an owner who has the utmost possible incentive that the strong motive of human selfishness supplies to enable him to succeed (which the state could not have), what possible hope can there be of any betterment of things by transferring all land to the state or to society collectively? Through what engine or machinery is it that the state is to conduct its farms to a profit, and so rent city lots as to produce more benefits than now exist? No one not stricken with asinine idiocy can begin to tell. . . . This whole scheme is all as shallow a piece of folly as the history of delusions will have to record. It will very properly take its place with "the moon hoax," and with Captain Symmes's tubular theory of the earth, when the nine days' wonder of it, now waning, shall have collapsed.

Somebody has been humbugging Mr. Benton. It would be a kindness to send him a copy of "Progress and Poverty," and a subscription to THE STANDARD.

Projecting his mind into the future, Mr. Bellamy (2) has drawn a picture of a society from which poverty, greed and crime have been completely banished, and in which the teachings of Christ are actual laws of life and conduct. Nobody feels the pressure of want; nobody denies himself the pleasure of to-day for the sake of security to-morrow; nobody marries for money, or remains unmarried for the want of it; nobody is envious of his fellows; nobody is richer than another; nobody is idle, and nobody is overworked. The supposed narrator of the story, a young Bostonian, being a sufferer from sleeplessness, has had constructed an underground chamber, where he can work undisturbed by the noises of the outer world. The existence of this apartment is known only to himself, his servant, and a professor of mesmerism, whom he employs to put him to sleep when sleep is unattainable by other means. In this

secret chamber he falls into a mesmeric trance one night in 1887, and in it he is discovered by some workmen digging a cellar toward the close of the year 2000. How he came to be so forgotten he never learns positively; but from the existence of a layer of ashes above the vault he concludes that the dwelling house must have been burned on the first night of his sleep, and that he himself was supposed to have perished in the flames. Having thus ingeniously accounted for the prolongation of his life during 113 years, the narrator proceeds to describe the society in which he finds himself on awakening.

The economic problem has been solved by the adoption of state socialism. The whole nation is resolved into an industrial army, in which every man and woman is compelled to serve, save when incapacitated by sickness or the duties of maternity, between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five. Dr. Lete, who throughout the narrative is the guide, philosopher and friend of the narrator, gives this description of the system of production:

The principle on which our industrial army is organized is that a man's natural endowments, mental and physical, determine what he can work at most profitably to the nation and most satisfactorily to himself. While the obligation of service in some form is not to be evaded, voluntary election, subject only to necessary regulation, is depended on to determine the particular sort of service each man is to render. As an individual's satisfaction in his term of service depends on his having an occupation to his taste, parents and teachers watch from early years for indications of special aptitudes in children. Manual industrial training is no part of our educational system, which is directed to general culture and the humanities, but a theoretical knowledge of the processes of the various industries is given and our youth are constantly encouraged to visit the workshops and are frequently taken on long excursions to acquire familiarity with special industries. Usually, long before he is mustered into service, a young man, if he has a taste for any special pursuit, has found it out, and probably acquired a great deal of information about it. If, however, he has no special taste and makes no election when opportunity is offered, he is assigned to any avocation among those of an unskilled character which may be in need of men.

The rate of volunteering for each trade is closely watched. If there be a noticeably greater excess of volunteers over men needed in any trade, it is inferred that the trade offers greater attractions than others. . . . It is the business of the administration to seek constantly to equalize the attractions of the trades. This is done by making the hours of labor in different trades to differ according to their arduousness. The lighter trades, prosecuted under the most agreeable circumstances, have in this way the longest hours, while an arduous trade, such as mining, has very short hours. . . . If any particular occupation is in itself so arduous or so oppressive that, in order to induce volunteers, the day's work in it had to be reduced to ten minutes, it would be done. If even then no man was willing to do it, it would remain undone.

Of these things produced every member of the community, old and young, sick and well, skillful and unskillful, is entitled to an equal share. That one man produces more or does better work than another is considered no reason for giving him a larger reward. Each is expected to do the best he can.

"But what inducement," I asked, "can a man have to put forth his best endeavors when, however much or little he accomplishes, his income remains the same? High characters may be moved by devotion to the common welfare under such a system, but does not the average man tend to rest back on his oar, reasoning that it is of no use to make a special effort, since the effort will not increase his income nor his withholding diminish his? "Does it then really seem to you," answered my companion, "that human nature is insensible to any motives save fear of want and love of luxury, that you should expect security and equality of livelihood to leave them with out possible incentives to effort? Your contemporaries did not really think so, though they might fancy they did. When it was a question of the grandest class of efforts, the most absolute self devotion, they depended on quite other incentives. Not higher wages, but honor and the hope of men's gratitude, patriotism, and the inspiration of duty, were the motives which they set before their soldiers when it was a question of dying for the nation, and never was there an age of the world when those motives did not call out what is best and noblest in men."

Reading all this, we cannot but regret that the author's devotion to an idea should have impelled him to impose on his fancied industrial system the tremendous weight of state socialism. Nor can we avoid a feeling of surprise that with his power of analysis—to which the whole book bears abundant testimony—he should have failed to see that his whole picture of twentieth century life is an attempt, not to justify socialism, but to excuse it—to show how men might be happy in spite of it. Thus his device of varying the hours of labor, so as to make occupations attractive or distasteful, according as production in them is carried too far or not far enough—what is it but a clumsy imitation of freedom? an attempt to effect, by state regulation, results which the natural, unhindered law of supply and demand would effect more certainly, more quickly, and at vastly less expense. Suppose men with equal rights of access to natural opportunities. Would not the reward of labor—in other words, the daily hours of toil necessary to secure subsistence—vary as production fell short of or exceeded the demand? Would not young men entering life select vocations according to their tastes and abilities? And would not the mere fact of their doing so diversify occupations that over production in any direction would be an impossibility? The boy with a taste for carpentering would become a carpenter, and in doing so would give employment to lumber men, to iron and coal miners, to nail and tool makers, to farmers, butchers, bakers, clothiers and a dozen other classes of men, all of whom in turn, impelled by the gentle but steady force of inclination, would be doing just the things for which they were best fitted, and increasing the demand for one another's product. In pleasant and easy vocations, as those of brokers, bank presidents, bookkeepers, etc., wages would be low, as in Mr. Bellamy's ideal community. In the more toilsome and disagreeable ones—mining, street sweeping, car driving and the like—they would range at higher figures. In every calling industry would of necessity receive on the average just that reward which would suffice to secure such production as the needs of the community required. If there should be not enough street sweepers, or too

many brokers, street sweepers' wages would rise slightly and brokers' wages fall; and the result would be, not that men already brokers would become street sweepers, but that of the young men entering life at that time, some, who would otherwise have become brokers would take to street sweeping. Natural law would effect instantaneously that adjustment of the balance of industries which state socialism would clumsily and tardily bring about by compilation of immense volumes of statistics and orders trickling from a central power through successive bureaux of administration.

But it is in the attempt to solve the problem of distribution that our author's supposititious state socialism breaks down most completely. Money and trade are completely done away with. Between private individuals there is neither buying nor selling. The nation, being the sole producer, is also the sole distributor. To every individual there is issued, once a year, a credit card for a certain number of dollars. With this card he can purchase at the public store houses whatever he wishes, the amount of each purchase being punched out of the card. An immense central warehouse in each city or district is kept supplied with such proportion of products as statistics show will be needed; and in each ward or village a public building is devoted to the display of samples. A purchaser selects by sample, gives his order to an attendant, has the amount of his purchase punched from his card, and the desired goods are delivered at his house by pneumatic tube.

It is easy to see from this illustration that there has been no real abolition of money, and that what has been done is not to abolish trade but to put it in fetters. Between a credit card for \$1,000 and government notes to the same amount, it is hard to find any difference except in kind, or that is not entirely in favor of the latter. And it would be impossible to imagine anything more clumsy than the attempt by a national bureau to keep a hundred thousand different neighborhoods supplied with just the needed quantities of perishable goods, and to so regulate prices as not only to cover the cost of labor and distribution, but also avoid inducing scarcity by low prices or superfluity by high ones. Mr. Bellamy indeed defends his credit card system on the ground that, the cards being non-transferable, the possession of a card demonstrates the owner's ethical right to it; whereas the ordinary money might be obtained by force or fraud. But he seems to forget that in banishing poverty he has done away with the chief incentive to those virtues, and he forgets, too, that, granting the survival of the impulse to rob or defraud, a thief or swindler would exercise his talents in getting possession of goods bought with money quite as cheerfully as in securing the money with which to buy goods.

Here is the way in which, under the credit card and national production system, a newspaper is produced. Dr. Lete is speaking:

"Supposing some of my neighbors or myself think we ought to have a newspaper reflecting our opinions and devoted especially to our locality, trade or profession. We go about among the people till we get the names of such a number that their annual subscriptions will meet the cost of the paper, which is little or big according to the largeness of its constituency. The amount of the subscriptions marked off the credits of the citizens guarantees the nation against loss in publishing the paper, its business, you understand, being that of a publisher purely, with no option to refuse the duty required. The subscribers to the paper now elect somebody as editor, who, if he accepts the office, is discharged from other service during his incumbency. Instead of paying a salary to him, as in your day, the subscribers pay the nation an indemnity equal to the cost of his support for taking him away from the general service. He manages the paper just as one of your editors did, except that he has no counting room to obey or interests of private capital as against the public good to defend. . . .

"How is the staff of contributors recompensed, since they cannot be paid in money? "The editor settles with them the price of their wares. The amount is transferred to their individual credit from the guaranteed credit of the paper, and a remission of service is granted the contributor for a length of time corresponding to the amount credited him, just as to other authors. As to magazines, the system is the same. . . .

What a frightful number of government book keepers will be needed in the year 2000 if Mr. Bellamy's dream should become reality. How long will it be before Dr. Lete and the rest of them will conclude that the most economical way to run a newspaper is not to hire an editor from the government, with punching of credit cards, and complete or partial release from labor in the national workshops, but to let the editor go ahead and do the best he can; secure that if he have no vocation toward editing a paper, he will surely and speedily find it out!

Mr. Bellamy is better skilled in social pathology than in social therapeutics. He sees clearly enough that before vice and selfishness and greed can be driven from the world, the poverty which engenders them must first be abolished. He sees, though with less clearness of vision, that the cause of poverty is the denial to mankind of their natural god-given rights. What he fails to see is that the way to abolish poverty is not by imposing fresh restrictions on men's freedom, but by sweeping away the restrictions that already exist. The way to abolish slavery—to make the slave the equal of the master, is not to fetter the master's hand and make all men slaves alike, but to strike the fetters from the slave, and make all men equal in freedom.

Let Mr. Bellamy consider and see what an impossible task he has supposed his men of the twentieth century to have accomplished. Within a hundred years they have elaborated a system of production and distribution so complicated, with such an infinity of parts whose co-ordination must be artificially adjusted and maintained, that the mind fairly reels before the attempt to imagine it. What infinite convolutions of tape, what tangles upon tangles of daily reports, what armies of lightning calculators and statisticians would be needed for its carrying out. And through what violence of confiscation, through what terrific social convulsions, is it to come into being? How is it to be started? Mr. Bellamy dismisses these questions very briefly, simply supposing the various commercial trusts to finally center in a grand trust of trusts, from which he leaps to his socialistic edifice at a single bound. But across how vast a chasm!

Yet, despite all its absurdities of socialism, "Looking Backward" is a delightful book. The

mind dwells with delight on the picture of a society from which poverty has been banished, in which every individual exhausts the rational possibilities of life day by day, taking no thought for the morrow, and in which men dwell together in peace and harmony, loving one another like brothers, and rejoicing in the equal enjoyment of the common Father's bounty and the good of one another. Such a society, founded, not on the tyranny of state socialism, but on the equal freedom of men, is no idle dream. How soon it may develop, how long it may be delayed, no man can tell. But that it is coming is certain. Let him who doubts its possibility look round him and reflect! The palaces of our cities, the wealth that crowds our warehouses, the ships and steamboats that throb across the ocean and dash to and fro upon our rivers, the iron roads and rushing trains that make Atlantic and Pacific neighbors, the electric wires and the cables annihilating space and time—what are these but trifling samples of the transforming power of human labor exercised upon the raw material of nature. Out of the earth they came, conjured by human industry, and to earth they will return, to be succeeded by fresh forms of beauty and of use to man. Let the single tax be imposed on land values, so that those who now control natural opportunities must either utilize them to the utmost or abandon them to be used by whomsoever will, and with what energy of delight will industry apply itself to the task of wealth production. Who is there among us, sound of mind and body, who cannot produce things he wants himself or that others stand in need of? Like the dew of heaven, wealth would gather round us. Poverty would flee from within our gates. And as its black shadow vanished the crime and greed that now flourish in its darkness would wither in the full glare of freedom's day. And then, indeed, Mr. Bellamy's sweet dream of the millennium would become a living truth.

It must be a delightful corner of Europe, that part of Portugal in which Oswald Crawford lives(1), and about which he writes so charmingly:

Northern Portugal is a highland country, full of springs and water runlets. The hill tops are covered with woods of pine and chestnut, the waste land is overgrown with furze, and white and yellow broom, and flowering cistus, and the narrow valley sides down to the brooks which run through their bottoms, are terraced everywhere into tiny meadows, each one bordered with vines borne on espaliers of wood, and each meadow is green throughout the winter with grass or clover, and in summer rich with the flowers of maize. In this gladsome landscape are set, innumerable small, gray, granite built farm houses, surrounded by cattle yards and lairs, and the sheds that cover the wine vats and wine presses. The farmers are themselves owners of the land they till and of the houses they dwell in, and there are signs of their ownership in the richness and comfort of their surroundings. Near each house is a tall yard, and generally orange and lemon trees grow hard by. Often there is a garden patch, gay with old fashioned country flowers, dahlias, and carnations, salvia, monthly roses, and the like. Very often there is a camellia tree or two, as large as apple trees with us, covered in very early spring with white or red blossoms.

Wherever else of plant growth there may be near the farmer's house, there never fails to be the broad flat expanse of trellised vines, covering arbor-wise a perch or two of ground, the trellised wood supported on tall stone pillars. Beneath the shade of the vine branches the ground is trodden flat and firm by the naked feet of men and women; for here, beneath the shadow of the vines, all the summer and autumn through, is the peasant's drawing room. Here, to the tinkling of their mandolins, they dance their rustic rounds and chant their strange old world songs and madrigals.

Isn't that a pretty picture of rural simplicity and happiness! How beautiful must such a country be in the springtime—and spring begins early in Portugal—when the pulses of the earth are beginning to stir and nature is just putting on her robe for the gladsome summer. The nightingales are singing in the hedges and the thickets, "the meadows and woods and every bank and corner of the land are gay with wild flowers. Everything is fresh and green in the sunny air of spring, and everywhere there is an incredible wealth, and force, and luxuriance of life." The whole population is astir and hard at work. They have plenty to do, indeed; for before the seed time of the land has well begun, the harvest time of the sea is upon them.

It is then that the huge shoals of sardines and of hake, which prey upon them, come nearest the Portuguese coast, and are drawn ashore in nets so long and heavy that I have seen the whole population of a sea hamlet—men, women and children—at the haul ropes, and drawing home, with shout and song, and laughter, the harvest of the sea. Sometimes even this force will not suffice for the weight of fish, and one may see, even on a crowded beach, too, do their share of yoke work—harnessed to the net and helping in the haul.

And the day's work done, the happy peasants gather in the arbor with their mandolins and songs, while the head of the family, following a custom that has lasted, Mr. Crawford says, well nigh two thousand years, draws the first jug of wine from the cask that holds the vintage of the previous autumn. For they actually drink wine, these pauper laborers of Portugal, and Mr. Crawford assures us that it is pretty good wine, too. The custom has descended from the ancient days of Roman domination, and "the grapes are still crushed, and their liquor fermented, in northern Portugal, precisely as Pliny and Cat directed."

I am not asserting that a golden age ever existed anywhere out of a poet's imagination, far less that it exists here in Portugal; but I will say this, that after traveling over most of the countries of Europe, I have found nothing that so nearly approaches it. I have seen no pastoral life so like what the poets have fabled in their legend of the golden age. In this country of his love, a region extending some thirty miles either side of the river Douro, from the coast to the frontier mountains of Spain, and containing about a million of people, Mr. Crawford has lived for many years, a farmer among farmers. He finds the people not merely stupidly content, but actually prosperous.

It is a remarkable circumstance in regard to the broad district I have described, and to parts of the land far beyond its borders, that the great wave of adversity which has come over the farmers of all western Europe, with cheap corn from the west, and from the east, (1)Springtime in Rural Portugal. Oswald Crawford in *Fortnightly Review* for April.

and from the south, starving the peasantry and bringing discontent and misery in its train, has never reached this corner of the continent. . . . I do not say so on the authority of returns and statistics. There are no such documents in this country, and I should not trust to them if there were. I say so because I have had a farm of my own for many years past, and because I have seen much of my brother farmers and am acquainted with their ways, and knowing the men I know their present welfare.

Several things, Mr. Crawford seems to think, have conduced toward this happy condition. In the first place, the landlords have fallen into a state of "innocuous desuetude." They still collect rent, but it is the rent fixed generations ago, and is never raised; and they live at a distance, where the farmers can't be bothered with them.

Though a nominal landlord exists as a person to whom rent is periodically paid, he does not live on or near the land, and he has no interest in it beyond the rent, has no power over it whatever save the wholesome one for the community, that he can evict in certain specified cases of deliberate and hurtful waste. The rent was no doubt a fair one, but now it has dwindled to a mere quit rent. Therefore the small farmer is a yeoman who practically owns the farm he tills.

Such a "rent" is clearly not rent at all. It is a fixed annual tax or tribute, burdensome, of course, but becoming lighter instead of heavier with improvements in cultivation, and increased facilities of access to market.

Next among the causes of prosperity is one that seems to puzzle Mr. Crawford—the protective tariff. "Every member of the Portuguese community is weighed down by a burden of protective duties varying from twenty-five per cent to seventy-five per cent or more on the value of everything from abroad that they eat, or drink, or wear, or sleep on, or drive in, ride on, play with, or smoke." Mr. Crawford avows himself a free trader, yet he feels himself compelled in candor to declare that the protective duties of thirty-seven and one-half cents a bushel on corn and on other cereals in proportion really do enable him and other farmers to cultivate their lands "with a comfortable profit." It may be that this "protection" does benefit the land owning farmer in Portugal, just as it benefits the owner of some kinds of mineral land in the United States, by enabling him to lay a special tax upon his fellow countrymen. But as in the United States, so in Portugal, we find that the effect of protection is to keep up the use of antiquated methods and tools and to prevent natural opportunities being utilized to anything like their fullest extent.

Traveling through this Minho province, this garden of Portugal, made so by man's incessant, loving labor, no one can fail to notice how the land is most unscientifically ill-tilled and every mistake and shortcoming apparent that a modern enlightened farmer would smile at—the "unimproved" plow, made of a crooked tree branch, the "unimproved" cows, that give but a fifth of the milk of a Gloucester or an Alderney, the grass blades slowly and painfully reaped by a toy reaping hook and carried long distances on the heads of men and women.

Free trader as he calls himself, Mr. Crawford thinks he sees in this wasteful system of cultivation one of the causes of the happiness around him. It makes work. Improved farming tools, better breeds of cattle, the use of machinery in agriculture, would diminish the demand for labor and convert the working people into tramps and paupers. He fails to see that his farmers and laborers are happy simply because with a nearly stationary population they have abundant access to natural opportunities on land and sea. Their crude, unscientific farming is simply a careless wasting of the proceeds of the tariff tax they collect from less fortunate Portuguese, and would come to an end very quickly if the 37½-cent-a-bushel duty on imported corn were done away with. It is true that, in that case, many of the non-land owning laborers who now dance to mandolins beneath the leafy arbors, and make merry on the honest country wine, would drift away to the cities, or enter local poor houses. But this sad change in their condition would illustrate, not the blessings of protection, but the truth that when men are disinherited of their right to use the earth, material progress, instead of benefiting them, turns into a curse, and they must either perish miserably or be kept alive at the expense of those who have usurped their heritage.

Meantime it might not be a bad idea if the authorities of Ohio, and Minnesota, and Colorado and others of our states where overcrowding population is breeding pauperism, would consider the advisability of some plan of assisted emigration to this happy country Mr. Crawford tells about:

The little houses are snug and warm, the cattle sleek under their masters' kindly eyes, the tiny granaries full to overflowing, the men on Sundays and feast days well dressed, well-fed, and light hearted, the women comely and gay in their colored bodices and bright silk kerchiefs, and their necks covered with a sensible weight of old fashioned gold jewelry. The valleys are ringing with the joyous antiphons of youths and girls, that speak as plainly of their content with life and of their hopefulness as the spring song of the birds tells of theirs.

There are millions of American citizens who can never hope for anything of that kind in their own country. And it costs only \$20 or \$30 to get to Portugal.

MISS AGATHA MUNIER IS NOW forming classes for instruction in vocal sight reading for ladies and gentlemen, as well as in solo singing in all its branches, and in elocution. For terms, etc., address MISS MUNIER, 223 East Thirty-second street, New York.

PRINTING.
CONCORD CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING COMPANY (Ld.)
104 Elm street, cor. Canal, N. Y.
BOOK, JOB AND NEWSPAPER PRINTING.

BRIGGS' PIANOS
5 APPLETON ST., BOSTON, MASS.
MANUFACTURERS OF
GRAND SQUARE AND UPRIGHT
Piano-Fortes
GRACEFUL DESIGNS • SOLID CONSTRUCTION
MATHLESS TONE • BEAUTIFUL FINISH

UNITY CONGREGATION.—MASONIC

TEMPLE, Sixth Avenue and Twenty-third Street

HUGH O. PENTOCOST,

MINISTER.

SERVICES:

Sunday Morning, 11 o'clock.

Sermons published weekly in the Twentieth Century, No. 1, 1000 pages. "What I Believe," by Hugh O. Pentecost, 200 pages. Elegantly printed. Large type. Wide margin. Price 25c. Address, 2 Oriental St., Newark, N. J.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A Gold Watch
For \$38. That tells the TRUTH.

Fully equal for Accuracy, Durability, Appearance and Service, to any \$75 Watch.

Philadelphia's building associations have done much toward building it up and making it the city of homes. The same system of co-operation carefully and economically managed, has built the Keystone Watch Club Co., and they are now selling more Watches to consumers than all others combined. They handle only the

Keystone Dust-proof Watch
which is deservedly regarded as the crown and climax of Pennsylvania's manufactures. This Watch contains every essential to accurate time-keeping, and many important improvements patented by the Company. They are Dust and Damp Proof, a quality possessed by no other movement in the world. Jewel steel throughout with genuine rubies in the Patent Wind and Set, strong and simple. Sold through authorized agents at \$38.00. Either all cash down or \$10.00 per week. No disappointment in this system. An active, reliable Agent Wanted to represent us in every city and town. Write for full particulars.

The Keystone Watch Club Co.
926 Chestnut St., PHILADELPHIA, PA.
Representatives—Any Commercial Agency.

Canned Goods
WITH THIS STAMP IN THE BOTTOM OF CANS ARE

Free from Poison.

AND ARE MADE BY ORGANIZED LABOR.

Piso's Remedies for Catarrh is the Best, Easiest to Use, and Cheapest.

COCATARRH
Sold by druggists or sent by mail. 50c. E. T. Hazeltine, Warren, Pa.

GOOD NEWS TO LADIES.
Greatest of all, now your time to get orders for our celebrated Catarrh Remedies, and to secure a beautiful Gold Band or Moss Rose China Tea Set, or a pair of elegant Mass Rose Toilet Set, Watch, Brass Lamp, Casket, or other desirable articles. Write to THE GREAT AMERICAN TEA CO., P. O. Box 280, 31 and 33 Vesey St., New York.

CHARLES B. SCHMIDT, PHOTOGRAPHER.
220 Third Avenue, cor. 12th Street, New York.
Children's Photographs by instantaneous process a specialty.

CALL FOR A MEETING TO FORM A NEIGHBORLY TAX LEAGUE.—All those persons interested in the single tax are requested to attend a meeting to be held on Monday evening, the 28th of May, in the Catholic Church, corner Alabama street and Jones avenue. Those advocating this system of taxation believe that the present system of personal property, buildings and other improvements should be abolished and replaced by a single tax on land values, which will secure the withholding of valuable lands from use. The discussion of the tariff question, which has been the subject of Cleveland's main message, and the introduction of the Mills bill into the house, suggest the presentation of the single tax question to the people. It is believed that this meeting will result in the formation of a Single Tax League to be of a purpose to secure such change. Those desiring information, as well as those believing in the Single Tax, will be welcome.

BOLTON SMITH, M. H. McDONELL.

CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 6, 1888.—To Single Tax Advocates, Greeting:—By virtue of the authority invested in me by letters on the 1st of my office from the several states and territories, a call is hereby issued for a national conference of the single tax advocates of the several states and territories and the district of Columbia of the United States, to convene in the city of CHICAGO, ILL., at ten o'clock a. m., on WEDNESDAY, JULY 4, 1888.

All persons who believe that the public revenues should be raised by a single and direct tax on the relative land values are invited to attend and take part in the deliberations.

The following is the general committee on arrangements:

Chairman, Warren Worre Bailey, No. 21 South Haymarket, Chicago.

Secretary, M. K. Lashelle, Times Building, Chicago.

Treasurer, Robert H. Cowdrey, 100 Quincy street, Chicago.

Judge James G. Maguire, San Francisco, Cal.

H. F. Ring, Houston, Tex.

H. Martin Williams, St. Louis, Mo.

L. P. Custer, Indianapolis, Ind.

Benjamin Adams, Charleston, S. C.

Freeman Knowles, Ceresco, Neb.

C. A. S. Higley, Minneapolis, Minn.

Thomas A. McCann, Detroit, Mich.

Richard L. Atkinson, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. Q. Norton, Honolulu, Ala.

WARREN WORRE BAILEY,
Chairman Provisional Committee.

Chicago, April 8.—All those who contemplate attending the national conference of single tax advocates, to be held in this city July 4 will confer a great favor on the committee by notifying the secretary of their intentions as soon as possible. The work of the committee will be made much easier if it may know about how many visitors to expect. Where a number of persons will come from any club or organization let the names be given. Where there is no concerted action it is requested that each person will write, saying that he will come. This will enable the committee to proceed in its arrangements intelligently, and also be a great aid in having the conference conveniently before the local public.

Address all letters to M. K. LASHELLE, Secretary Provisional Committee, Times Building, Chicago, Ill.

KANSAS STATE LEGISLURE.—THE undersigned state legislatures have been called to call for work anywhere in the state of Kansas. Address Rev. W. M. BROWN, Box 281, Lawrence, Kan.

REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE CLEVELAND land and labor club are held on Monday evenings at 8 o'clock, room No. 10, 100 Broadway. Everyone is cordially invited to attend our meetings.

JAMES BOGAN, PRINCIPAL AGENT for James Means' 83 and 84 shoes. 225 BOWERY, near Fifth street.